

THE  
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

OCTOBER TO DECEMBER, 1844.

---

*The Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church for the first Four Hundred Years after Christ, together with its Declension from the Fifth Century downwards, to its present State. By NATHANIEL MARSHALL, D.D. Anglo-Catholic Library Edition. Oxford: J. H. Parker. 1844.*

THE public law of the Church ought especially, and most carefully, to be considered with reference to the ultimate objects of the several institutions governed by its provisions. The practical part of ecclesiastical government and administration, may, it is true, be carried on in its outward form by means of an accurate appreciation of what the law is according to its correct and equitable construction; and it is necessary that there should be men devoted to that particular kind of legal learning. The intricacy of the great body of ecclesiastical law, and the mass of temporal law which spreads with innumerable ramifications into every part of the ecclesiastical constitution, render the study of the laws by which the Church is governed as a mere system of rules, a task sufficing to occupy the life of an ordinary man, especially if he is required to advise and act in the daily transaction of ecclesiastical affairs. But there must also be those who, less occupied with the technicalities and minutiae of the practice of business, penetrate into the reasons and objects, and investigate the spirit of every portion of the ecclesiastical body politic. This is the method of study which belongs to a prelate and an ecclesiastical statesman, and which is most required in our own branch of the Catholic Church. And such we find to have been the method of the great canonists. Thus they define the Canon Law to be that law which directs the actions of men to eternal beatitude,\* or the

\* Lancelot, Inst. lib. i. tit. i. § 1.

law which directs mankind to a good life, and the attainment of spiritual welfare\*—grand and comprehensive definitions, containing within the compass of a few words the whole scope and object of the laws of the Church, and of a churchman's life. In this sense it is that Hostiensis calls the Canon Law *scientiarum omnium scientia*. It is the science of the whole construction and polity of the universal Church, in all its offices, functions, and obligations, directed to the fulfilment of the great purpose for which it was originally founded.

We say advisedly, that the study of the Church in this particular way, is much needed in our own Church. We are apt to look upon the external constitution of the Church too much as that of an eleemosynary body, entrusted with the use and administration of property, and the maintenance of discipline (in the most confined sense of the word) among the clergy. Everything beyond the defining of legal duties and the form of legal institutions is thus held to be exclusively within the province of theology. Thus we have the science of principles of doctrine entirely separated from the institutions and the discipline, which are the carrying out and the practical application of those principles, while those institutions, and that discipline, deprived of their vivifying spirit and life, are like some great and majestic building dismantled and deserted, the purposes of whose various parts are rather matter of curious investigation than of intelligible and practical use. To this state of ecclesiastical learning we may, among other things, attribute the loss of our capitular bodies. They were looked upon with a view to their actual condition and uses as parts of the machinery of the Church, considered as a means of celebrating divine worship, and not as parts of that grand system of polity and spiritual government, having for its object "*to direct the actions of men to eternal beatitude.*" They were looked upon in a financial and economic point of view, rather than as parts of a great scheme of spiritual government and discipline. And in this narrow manner they were treated by most of the prelates in the House of Lords. We see an indication of the same defective judgment in the disinclination shown by persons in authority to consider matters of Ecclesiastical legislation or reform, with reference to *doctrine*, as it is emphatically called. If possible, the theological part of every question is thrown aside, and the matter is discussed on mere administrative grounds.

It is assumed that it is a great advantage to reduce questions of ecclesiastical legislation to such a dry state as to be palatable and comprehensible to the strange crowd of half educated men, and heretics, and infidels, who form a large section of the House

\* Barbosa, Collect. tom. v. p. 16. Et vid. Panormitan. Comm. in lib. i. x. tit. de Constit.



of Commons. No doubt this is convenient to parliamentary leaders, but we mention it merely as an indication of that state of things which we are endeavouring to combat.

As the laws and institutions of the Church are considered without reference to the reasons on which they are founded, and the ultimate objects which they have in view as parts of that polity which is the practical application and carrying out of the doctrines of Christianity, it follows that there can be no enlarged and statesmanlike cultivation of the Ecclesiastical Law. Thus there is no one between the practising lawyer, who thinks and knows of nothing but the practical part of the law as administered in the courts, almost exclusively with reference to property, and the theologian, exclusively learned in dogmatical and controversial theology. The science of ecclesiastical public law, which consists in the knowledge of what may be called the constitutional law of the Church, and the entire polity on which its external frame is constructed, with the reasons and uses of every part thereof, is, consequently, obsolete, and neglected among us. Yet the value of this branch of knowledge must be obvious. It is only requisite that its absence should be perceived, to render all men of thought and prudence desirous of its restoration.

We will, therefore, not detain our readers with the multitude of reasons and proofs which might be adduced to show how necessary it is for the welfare of our Church that this defect should be remedied: we will confine ourselves to one branch of the subject, to which the work that stands at the head of this article relates. It will furnish abundant materials for comment, with especial reference to the application of moral theology to the law and external polity of the Church, and the examination of that law and polity considered as the means adapted to the attainment of a certain end, which is that of the whole Canon Law.

The republication of that book may do much good at the present time. It gives a valuable account of a very essential part of the constitution of the primitive Church. This, in a mere historical point of view, must be interesting. It shows that many things which are stigmatized or proscribed in our days as exclusively belonging to the Church of Rome, are really primitive, and are recommended by saints and prelates, and acknowledged by all the best writers of our Church to be of the highest authority. But what we wish most to bring before our readers, is this. Dr. Marshall's book explains a part of the law of the Church, which consists in the practical application and administration of certain important doctrines. That application and administration must affect the ultimate fate of the Christian in two ways; that is to say, first, because their object is to educate and guide him by warnings, and examples, and the exercise of a salutary discipline to forsake his sins, and to prac-

tise all the duties of a Christian; and, secondly, because they affect the participation of offenders in the sacraments, and prayers, and communion of the Church, by the exercise of the power of the keys.

The power of the keys is exercised by the administration of spiritual justice in the tribunal of penitence. Perhaps the reader may think that this last proposition is expressed somewhat too broadly; and, in one sense, it may be so, for the power of the keys is sometimes exercised in a tribunal which is not, strictly speaking, the tribunal of penitence; but on the other hand, every tribunal of ecclesiastical criminal justice is a tribunal of penitence. Every such tribunal proceeds *pro salute animæ*, having principally in view the repentance and amendment of the offender—a principle from whence many important consequences are deduced. It may, therefore, be laid down that the principles of the penitential discipline of the Church affect the whole administration of criminal justice in the Church. But before we proceed further, it is necessary to consider the origin, nature, and parts of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; we shall then see how the whole power of discipline flows from the spiritual jurisdiction of the Church, and is to be exercised according to certain laws, and by means of the government provided by the constitution of the Church.

The state of sin to which mankind are reduced by their first parents is such, that they can form no numerous association capable of long existence, unless those who compose it are subjected to certain laws, and unless those who violate such laws are made liable to punishment. We find, accordingly, that the Founder of the Church, intending that Church to form a society among mankind which should be perpetuated until the end of the world, vested in the Church the power of publishing the laws delivered by Him, of establishing new laws, and of punishing those who are disobedient to such laws. Thus He said to the apostles, "*Those who hear you hear Me, and those who despise you despise Me.*" And He promised to St. Peter, and through him to the Church, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the power of binding and loosing.\*

By virtue of those powers, the apostles established deacons, ordained priests, regulated in the council of Jerusalem what Gentile converts were bound to practise, and prescribed the order to be observed in ecclesiastical assemblies. St. Paul used that authority when he excommunicated the incestuous Corinthian, and afterwards ordered his restoration to communion, and when he anathematized the preacher of false doctrine. There is scarcely a page in the Acts of the Apostles where we do not find instances of the exercise of the powers granted to the apo-

\* Hericourt, L. Eccles. ch. i.

stles by Divine authority; and the successors of those first ministers of the gospel have preserved that same authority, for when the apostles were commanded to go and teach all nations, it was with this addition, "*I will be with you to the end of the world.*" The meaning of this is, *I will be with you, and those who lawfully succeed to you, in the exercise of the authority which I have entrusted to you, and to them, through you.*

Here we find the origin of ecclesiastical jurisdiction taken in its largest sense; that is to say, the whole authority vested in the Church. That authority was granted to the whole body of the apostles. Each bishop is to exercise it over the part of the Church confided to him, and all the bishops together are to govern the entire Church jointly and severally.\*

The bishop is invested with the plenitude of the sacerdotal power, parts of which he communicates to inferior ministers, who represent him in the exercise of his jurisdiction, but the bishop still preserves the supreme jurisdiction and preeminence.† Having thus shown the origin of ecclesiastical authority or jurisdiction in the largest sense of the word, and its general form, we must proceed to distinguish its different parts.

In the first place, our Saviour exercised no temporal power Himself. He said that His kingdom was not of this world, and He granted no temporal power to the apostles. It follows from thence that the jurisdiction belonging to the Church by Divine right consists only in the power of teaching all nations, of remitting sins, of administering the sacraments, and of punishing, by purely spiritual penalties, those who violate the ecclesiastical laws.‡ To these branches of jurisdiction the power of making ecclesiastical laws is necessarily incident.

The secular powers have enlarged the jurisdiction of the Church by the addition of the following privileges:—

1st. An exterior tribunal for the cognizance of causes, invested with the sanction of the civil power.

2dly. The cognizance of certain things which are properly of a temporal nature, such, for instance, as the testamentary matters.

These additions must be carefully distinguished from the spiritual authority of the Church. With the second we have no concern here. As for the first, it is clearly the addition of a certain form or certain accidents to the jurisdiction of the Church without affecting its substance, which being of Divine right must remain immutable.

We shall find a similar combination of spiritual and temporal laws in the body of ecclesiastical law. "In the civil law of each nation," says the Chancellor D'Aguepau, "and in all that belongs to the external government of civil society, there is

\* Hericourt, L. Eccles. ch. i. p. 185.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid. ch. i. § 2.

unity of power, of legislation, and of law ; because there is but one sovereign authority from which all that forms the law emanates as from its source, and which is the common centre at which all the radii of the circle unite.

"But the same simplicity is not to be found in ecclesiastical law. The Church is in the State, and not the State in the Church,\* as it has been well observed by an ancient ecclesiastical writer ; and St. Augustine has still better expressed the first principles of this matter, where he says, that the prince must not only serve God as a man, but he is moreover bound to serve God as a king ; that is to say, to use his power for the purpose of causing the honour and worship due to the Divinity to be rendered to Him ; to protect religion and its ministers ; to lend his power to procure the observance, not only of the rules common to all Christians, but also of the laws peculiar to ecclesiastics ; to supply what is wanting to the authority of the Church, restraining by the fear of temporal punishment those who are not sufficiently impressed with the fear of spiritual punishments ; and, in a word, to do in the service of God all those things which can only be done by a king.

"From this doctrine it follows, that there must be in ecclesiastical law, a great number of matters which may be called *mîxt*, in which the temporal power concurs with the spiritual, and where those two powers, without being subordinate to each other, ought to lend each other mutual assistance, in order, that being both derived from God, they may act each in its proper way for the glory of their author, and the happiness, not only temporal but eternal, of their subjects.

"There is consequently a double power in ecclesiastical law ; a double authority ; double legislation ; double laws, and judgments of two different species."†

Such are the general results of the combination and cooperation of the spiritual and temporal powers one assisting the other, which it was necessary to explain in order that we might distinguish the one from the other, and direct the mind of the reader more correctly to that part of the authority of the Church, which is exercised over purely spiritual matters. That authority is divisible into two grand branches ; that is to say, voluntary jurisdiction, and contentious jurisdiction.

Voluntary jurisdiction is that which is exercised *de plano*, that is to say, without a tribunal, and without opposition or contention, on the part of those who are the objects of that jurisdiction. It is divisible into two parts : 1st. Voluntary

\* This is to be understood as applying only to the external Church, considered with reference to each State taken by itself ; for the Catholic Church as a spiritual body embraces and comprehends all states.

† D'Aguepan, Œuvres, tom. i. p. 416. See also the preamble of the Statute of Appeals, Stat. 24, Hen. VIII. ch. xii.

jurisdiction, according to the strict meaning of the word jurisdiction; that is to say, an authority exercised in a judicial form on allegations and proof, followed by a decree or judgment; and 2dly, Voluntary jurisdiction, which consists in the administration and the performance of certain functions extra-judicially. This is called jurisdiction only in the wider meaning of that word.

Contentious jurisdiction is that which is exercised *in invitato*, with a judicial cognizance of the cause, and so that a decree may be made against a party not submitting.\*

Both the voluntary jurisdiction of the first species, and the contentious jurisdiction, are distinguishable into two parts; the civil and the criminal or penal. The first tends to the adjudication of a right, or the performance of a legal action, and the second to the punishment and amendment of a violator of the laws.†

The reader has now before him a skeleton map of the authority of the Church in all its branches, showing whence it is derived, and what are the parts of which it is composed. The analysis which we have now concluded will enable us to discover the nature of penitential discipline, and its place in the economy and constitution of the Church.

The spiritual jurisdiction of the Church differs from that of the temporal power in this respect—the former has for its object to lead the faithful to eternal peace in heaven, while the end of the latter is the external peace and tranquillity of the State. The criminal laws of the State have sufficiently fulfilled their end if they have prevented violations of the law by outward acts prejudicial to individuals or to society; but it is otherwise with the spiritual laws of the Church—their object is much more extensive. They regard not only the external order and peace of the society to which they belong, but also the conscience of each individual member of that society. Their jurisdiction is necessarily not merely external, but also internal. They do not seek merely the prevention of offences, nor the prevention of offences coupled with the outward amendment of the offender: they seek the prevention of offences, and the spiritual restoration of the offender by repentance, and the means which the Church affords for the remission of sins, and the purification of the heart. In like manner the remainder of the laws of the Church which have not a criminal or penal character are directed, not only to outward order and peace, but to the direction of the conscience, and the promotion of the internal welfare of each individual Christian, either directly or indirectly.

\* Voet. ad Pand. lib. ii. tit. i. § 3.

† It is perhaps necessary to explain that even the voluntary jurisdiction of the Church in some cases has a criminal nature, as where an offender himself asks the interposition of the Church for his absolution and restoration.

Thus we find that the whole power of discipline in the Church springs from the spiritual jurisdiction granted to the apostles, and transmitted to their successors, and especially from the power of the keys, although that power is divided into different branches, and exercised in different forms; either by the spiritual power alone, or by the spiritual power assisted by the temporal power; and either by the spiritual law alone, or by the spiritual law and the temporal law together.

It is to the criminal branch of the Church's jurisdiction that we must here specially direct our attention. We have already said, that the power of the keys is exercised in the tribunal of penitence by the administration of spiritual justice. This will appear by a short sketch of the history of the ecclesiastical criminal jurisdiction.

In the early ages of the Church, almost every crime was punished by authority of the Bishops.\* It was indeed necessary that the rulers of the Church should be invested with that authority; and the general principles of this part of the subject are well treated by Dr. Marshall, who, in the very commencement of his book, speaking of the penitential discipline of the early Church, says:—

“Somewhat there is of this kind which is founded in common reason, that the Church, as a society, should have the powers belonging to her which are necessary to her support and preservation.

“Now, there can be no society without government, and there can be no government without a power to encourage the orderly and obedient, and to discourage gainsayers, and such as walk disorderly.

“But then, as our Saviour's kingdom is not of this world, it was none of his purpose to interfere with the rules of it, nor to invest the governors of his Church with any other powers than what should be purely spiritual.

“Some outward and visible form of government was, however, necessary to the Church for her external polity; and as there was an outward admission to the privileges of Church membership, so it was expedient to the honour of the spouse of Christ, and, from the design of her founder, requisite that she should retain no scandalous followers in communion with her; and therefore, as they were admitted into fellowship with her by one solemn ceremony (namely, that of baptism), it was very proper that they should be cut off from her by another, (namely, that of spiritual censure) . . . Again, that upon their humble desire of reconciliation, they should be restored by a third (namely, that of absolution). And finally, that the intercourse and commerce between her faithful members should be maintained by her great sacrifice of praise in the holy Eucharist.

“Since the Church of Christ is really a society, and yet hath none of that outward coercive power wherewith the civil magistrate enforces his laws, it was fit she should have something in lieu of it,

---

\* Van Espen, pars iii. tit. iv. cap. i. § 1.



whereby her members might either be kept to rule, or else be disowned by her, and excluded from all further correspondence or communion with her."—Pp. 7, 8.

It would have been desirable that the author should have defined what he understood by penitential discipline, and have shown what place it holds in the scheme of the Church's government and authority, before he proceeded to demonstrate its use. His argument, moreover, extends to the whole criminal jurisdiction of the Church, and he no where shows clearly what is the precise nature of penitential discipline strictly so called, as contradistinguished from the criminal justice of the Church, exercised in the external and contentious forum. These omissions, and this defect in the method of the book, rendered necessary the exposition which we have made concerning ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Dr. Marshall, however, very neatly and correctly shows the grounds of reason on which the jurisdiction of the Church is founded.

He next proceeds to show the express charter which the Church has for this authority:—

"Now that the Church hath some powers of this kind to take cognizance of her members' offences, we may learn from our Saviour's direction in case of a brother trespassing against another. First, there was to be a private admonition; if that would not do, it was to be repeated in the presence of one or two witnesses. If this method proved unsuccessful, the Church he belonged to was to be interested in the matter; he was to be solemnly convened and rebuked in public. But if nothing of all this would be available, then as the last remedy he was to be expelled from it, to be as a heathen and a publican. And whatsoever should thus be done on earth, in virtue of our Saviour's commission, (for it was not to the mixed multitude, but to his own immediate disciples that our Lord upon this occasion spoke) had a promise of being ratified in heaven. 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.' The authority he had before given to St. Peter, upon a particular occasion, he here confirmed to his other disciples.

"The Jews, we shall see, were enough acquainted with the terms of binding and loosing, of being to them as a heathen man and a publican, to understand the full import of them without further explanation." "So we are not to wonder if this authority was couched in expressions which to us, at this distance, may seem loose and general, intricate and involved; because at the time when they were delivered, they had a clear and well-known reference to the current practice of excommunication which our Lord, apparently, hence intended to adopt into his church.

"Origen so interprets this passage,\* or tells us at least that the bishops of his time claimed hence their powers. 'The bishops (says

---

\* Origen, Latin Basil edit. in part i. Super Matthæum, tract i.

he) make the same application of that saying (viz. of binding and loosing) which St. Peter did; and have received the keys of the kingdom of heaven from our Saviour, and teach us, that whatsoever they bind here, *i.e.* condemn, is bound likewise in heaven; and whatsoever they loose here is loosed in heaven.'

"In St. John we have a still more emphatical and solemn renewal of these powers to the apostles, after our blessed Lord's resurrection, when he seemed to be giving his last orders. 'Then said Jesus unto them, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.'"—Pp. 10, 11.

These are the Divine authorities from which the whole criminal jurisdiction of the Church flows: and it is very important to observe that they all have a direct reference to the conscience of the offender, and the remission of sins. Thus that extensive criminal jurisdiction which we have already said existed in the early ages of the Church was uniformly exercised *sacramentali ratione*. Although the bishops inquired into offences, heard witnesses, and proceeded by censures and other canonical penalties against sinners, yet all this tended to the reconciliation of the offender. Moreover, all that the Church did respecting crimes, was connected with the internal penitential discipline, and referred, either antecedently or consequentially, to the internal forum of penitence.\*

During the whole of the first eleven centuries, the external forum was not separated from the internal, which in one sense is also called the sacramental, forum, but both were united by the closest bonds one with the other; or rather, whatever was done in the external forum was referred to the internal forum of penitence. There was not one person who absolved from excommunication, and another who absolved from sin, to whom the sinner was to be remitted after absolution from excommunication: nor was there one tribunal in which the person to be excommunicated, or actually excommunicated, was to be judged, and another to which the penitent after absolution was amenable; but the same judge in the same tribunal performed both functions.† Nevertheless, it is not to be inferred from this that there were not judicial forms in the administration of this discipline. Such forms were, indeed, necessary, for the Church to be satisfied judicially in each case, and that justice might be so administered as to produce edification.‡

About the seventh century, a distinction was made between *public* sins and *occult* sins; the former of which were the object

\* Van Espen, pars iii. tit iv. cap. i. § 4, tom. iv. p. 109. Morinus de Administr. Sacram. Pœnit. lib. i. cap. ix. x.

† Van Espen, ubi sup. § 6.

‡ Ibid. § 8.

of public penitence, while the latter were left to *secret*, or *occult* penitence; and the former was administered by the bishops and their representatives, while the latter belonged to the priests; but still there was no separation between the external and the internal forum.\* It is clear, therefore, that notwithstanding the distinctions which existed between different kinds of sins, the penitential discipline of the first ages embraced the whole criminal jurisdiction of the Church, and was a most important part of its ordinary government and administration. It was administered as a whole, by virtue of the power of the keys, and by means of the ordinary machinery of the ecclesiastical polity.

We will now proceed to see the account which our author gives of the manner in which this power was exercised by the Church in the first four centuries:—"Excommunication," he observes, "was never pronounced, except where the case was desperate, either by the obstinacy, or else by the severity, of the Church's regimen, which admitted its members but once to solemn penance. Excommunication was usually intended to bring men to submission; upon which they were gradually received, as they passed through the several courses of penitential discipline assigned to them." And he cites the Apostolical Constitutions, to show that excommunication was used after repeated admonitions to compel an obstinate offender to submit; after which he was made to go through various degrees of penance proportioned to his guilt.†

We here find excommunication used solely with reference to the penitential forum, and not as a punishment for the sake of example. It was used for the purpose of bending the offender to repentance, in order to render him a fit recipient of absolution, and not in a manner analogous to the punishments of the temporal laws, which strike the offender for the sake of example, and there leave him.‡ A change took place in the twelfth century, when the external was separated from the internal forum; and in the former, excommunication was used *per modum pœnæ*, though still medicinally, and with a view to the repentance and amendment of the offender, which is ever the primary object of the severity of the Church.§ But to this part of the subject we shall come somewhat later.

"When he (the offender) was under the highest sentence of excommunication, (continues Dr. Marshall) the Church had no farther care of him than of a heathen; but when that had wrought its intended effect, and melted him into penitential submission, then, as he was

\* Van Espen, *ibid.* § 9.

† Penitential Discipline, pp. 31—33. Apostol. Constit. lib. ii. cap. 37, 38, and *Ibid.* in cap. 39.

‡ Van Espen, *pars* iii. tit. xi. cap. i. § 2.

§ Covarruvias, *Op.* tom. i. p. 318, Num. 11.

first received into the Church through the door of baptism, so here he was restored to it through that of penance.

"The constituent parts of which discipline were these three; 1. Confession; 2. Segregation; 3. Absolution."—P. 33.

We doubt the correctness of this arrangement of the parts of penance. In the first place, confession in cases of occult sin is rather a preliminary act than a portion of the process of penance. Such is the confession referred to by Origen, in the two passages cited by our author, which are as follows:—

"If any one is so well disposed as to come forth and accuse himself when he is conscious of any crime committed by him, and if then his friends and acquaintance, instead of sympathizing with his affliction, shall stand off from him on that account, he should not be concerned at it, nor ought he to regard their scoffs nor their censure, but he should rather look up to God and regard his own soul . . . Let my kindred, if they please, forsake me, and stand afar off, whilst I obtain of myself to be my own accuser, and to confess my faults when no one else would accuse me for them; whilst I do not imitate those who when arraigned, and even convicted by clear evidence, would fain, notwithstanding, conceal their crimes."

The second passage is still more to the purpose:—

"As they who are troubled with indigestion, and have any thing within them which lies crude upon their stomach, are not relieved but by proper evacuations; so sinners who conceal their practices, and retain them within their own breasts, feel in themselves an inward quietude, and are almost choked with the malignity which they thus suppress. But by confession and self-accusation they discharge themselves of their burthen, and digest, as it were, the crudity which was so oppressive. Only here it will be fit to advise them that they be careful in choosing a fit person to whom they may open their minds with profit and advantage; that they try to find out such a spiritual physician, who knows how to mourn with them that mourn, to be weak with them that are weak; in fine, to be tender and compassionate, and such an one upon the whole as having approved his skill to them, may give them reason to depend upon his counsel, and to follow it; and so if he shall judge their case to be what may need the care of a public animadversion, and deserve to be laid open in the face of the Church for the edification either of themselves or others, this may be done deliberately and discreetly, and agreeably to the directions of such an approved physician."—Pp. 34, 35.

And Dr. Marshall then cites Tertullian's reflections on those who, through a false modesty, conceal their sins.

All this evidently refers to confession, which is preliminary to penance. And with regard to public and solemn confession, it seems to be rather a preparation for, and circumstance of, the

\* Origen in Psalm xxxvii. Hom. 2, Latin Basil edit. tom. i. [edit. Bened. tom. ii. p. 686.]

stations of penance, than one of the parts thereof. Segregation, too, is incident to excommunication, and to several degrees of penance; and absolution cannot be correctly called a part of the discipline of penance. On the whole, we prefer the method of the Canonists, who distinguish the parts of this discipline according to the four degrees, or stations, of penance.

Excommunication is the separation of the Christian from the communion of the Church;\* and the process or discipline of penance resulted, or was intended to terminate in readmission to the communion of the Church. That discipline was regulated by a code of rules, called the Penitential Canons, formed out of the provisions of councils, and the doctrines of the fathers of the Church. And it was the practice of the early Church, that, whenever any new or particularly grave case of delinquency arose, a number of bishops should assemble for the purpose of deliberating and deciding thereupon; and then their determination was signified to, and became a rule for the whole of the clergy. Such was the solicitude of the ancient bishops to devise and follow that system of discipline which was the most calculated to restore sinners, by leading them to a thorough and effectual repentance. Van Espen mentions an instance of this nature in the 53d Epistle of St. Cyprian. In that case, six bishops consulted him on this question, whether those persons could be admitted to reconciliation after three years of penance, who had courageously suffered frequent torments before the magistrate and the people, and had conquered; but afterwards, when tried by the proconsul, and severely tortured for a length of time, had, at length, fallen into apostasy. And the bishops did not only consult St. Cyprian, but requested him to communicate the question with the other bishops. The words of St. Cyprian are as follows:—

“Quoniam tamen scripsistis ut cum pluribus collegis de hoc ipso plenissime tractem; et res tanta exigit majus et impensius de multorum collatione consilium, et nunc omnes fere inter Paschæ prima solemnia apud se cum fratribus demorantur, quando solemnitati celebrandæ apud suos satisfecerint et ad me venire cœperint, tractabo cum singulis plenius, ut de eo quod consulistis figatur apud nos et rescribatur nobis firma sententia multorum sacerdotum consilio ponderata.”—*Van Espen*, par. ii. tit. vi. cap. iii. § 5. Op. omn. tom. ii. p. 176.

There are also instances of these deliberations and decisions in the Council of Nicea, and others of the early councils, and in the works of many of the fathers, as well as of the care bestowed upon the task of adapting the discipline of penance to each specific case. Thus, in an Epistle of St. Peter Alexandrinus, there are fourteen canons, in which each species of relapse from the faith is examined, and a proper penance affixed to each, that the

\* Covarruvias, in *Constitut. Alma Mater*, Comment. Oper. omn. tom. i. p. 315.

same rule might be observed in the whole patriarchate of Alexandria.

But nothing is more remarkable than the canonical Epistle of St. Basil, containing eighty-five canons, which, with scarcely an exception, regard only the penances to be enjoined in the case of particular sins. St. Basil composed those canons at the request, and to satisfy the questions, of St. Amplilochius, Bishop of Iconium.\*

There is also a remarkable instance in the Decree of Gratian, which deserves particular mention. Frontarius, Bishop of Bordeaux, wrote to Pope Nicholas, informing him that a wicked man, named Burgandus, with his retainers, had violently attacked him while celebrating divine service, and seized on the sacred vessels. The Archbishop then asked the Pope what course he ought to pursue towards the sacrilegious offenders in the event of their submitting themselves to perform penance; and the Pope appoints a course of penance for four years, as follows:—

“For the first year let them remain out of the church of God, whose sacred vessels they did not scruple to seize. During the second year let them remain outside of the gates of the church without communion.† In the third year let them enter the church, but assist among the hearers, without making any oblation, neither eating flesh, nor drinking wine, excepting on the days of the nativity and the resurrection. In the fourth year, (if the penance of the former three shall have produced fruit) let them be restored to the communion of the faithful, promising with their whole minds that they never will so offend in future, and let them be admitted to receive the body and blood of the Lord, and then, until the seventh year, let them remain penitent for three days in each week, abstaining from meat and wine.”  
—*Cons. xii. Quest. ii. Can. xvii.*

In process of time, as the penitential canons increased,—and especially after the eighth century, when the imposition of penances in cases of occult sin came into the hands of the priests,—books were composed, containing compilations of those canons, with the opinions of the fathers, and were called *Penitentiales*, or penitential books. They were given to the clergy with the sanction of the bishops as a direction to them in the tribunal of penitence.‡ Hence, in an order of Celebration of Synods, composed about the tenth century, among other admonitions to the bishop and priests, there is this:—

“Feria IV. ante Quadragesimam, Plebem ad Confessionem invite ei

\* Covarruvias, in *Constitut. Alma Mater*, Comment. Oper. omn. tom. i. § 7, 8, 9.

† The Gloss explains that during the first year the penitents were to be excluded from the cemetery or consecrated ground round the church, and in the second from the church itself only.

‡ One of these compilations is usually to be found appended to the Decree of Gratian, in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*.



ei juxta qualitatem delicti pœnitentiam injungite, non ex corde, sed sicut in *Pœnitentiali* scriptum est.”—*Van Espen*, ubi sup. §§ 13, 14.

Thus it appears that it was the policy of the early Church to reduce this discipline as much as possible to uniformity, and to avoid the arbitrary imposition of penances by the clergy.

We come now to consider the constituent parts of penitential discipline, which we will arrange according to the four stations, or degrees, through which, successively, the penitent was required to pass. Those four degrees are specified in the canon appended to the canons in the canonical Epistle of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, and compiled from them. These degrees are named as follows:—1. Fletus; 2. Auditio; 3. Substratio; and, 4. Consistentia.\*

Dr. Marshall, speaking of the discipline of segregation, which was, in fact, common to the three first degrees, or stations, being the separation of the sinner from the faithful, informs us, that the two famous periods respecting this discipline were that which preceded the heresy of Montanus and Novatus, especially the latter, and that which followed it; and that the whole of this discipline was milder before that period than after it. The Montanists and Novatians held certain sins to be irremissible by the Church, though the sinner might be benefited by penance; and thus Tertullian, who had gone over to the Montanists, makes a distinction between remissible and irremissible sins. They did not deny that God would pardon these mortal sins, but they denied that the Church could absolve from them. Their severity wrought up the discipline of the Church to a higher pitch, and increased the severity of penance. And it is doubted (according to our author) by learned men whether the stations of penance were so distinguished before the times of Montanus and Novatus, as they were after them.

“However it be (he continues), the assignment of penitents for so many years to the station of mourners; for so many to that of hearers; for so many more to that of the prostrate; and further yet, for so many to that of bystanders this was all the undoubted language of the fourth century; and many hence, as finding no earlier footsteps of it which could with certainty be distinguished, have concluded it the product of that age.”—Pp. 45—52.

“Yet what will be cited from St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, and what hath been cited from Tertullian, looks, it must be owned, like a distinction of penitential stations even in the third century. The one hath expressly mentioned the station of hearers in a manner which seems to imply that he was no stranger to that of mourners, since people who were to be driven from the station of hearers were, in all likelihood, driven to that of mourners, as the next in rank and order to the former. In which respect they were a little worse treated than

\* *Van Espen*, ubi sup. § 17.

Jews or heathens, who might all, we have seen, if they pleased be hearers. The other (*viz.* Tertullian) seems to have had in view some distinction between such as were denied a communion in prayer with the faithful, and such as were further banished from all sacred commerce. But since this is not so clear as the former case, I do not build upon it.

"I am apt, however, to suspect that the practice might be about this time in its birth, inasmuch as we find it so soon after grown up to its full proportions.

"Yet I suppose it grew not up in all places alike, nor proceeded every where by the same steps . . . Basil himself, who lived in the middle of the fourth century, hath lineally described to us all the stations of penance which by that time had got into full and current use; since he doth not recite them as novel practices, but as the established rules of the then prevailing discipline."—*Pp.* 52, 53.

It seems to us that the different practices of which the stations consisted, were all well known, and in use, in the third century, though their distinct arrangement and classification were probably effected somewhat later. This, however, is not a matter of great importance, as it regards form and accidents, rather than the substance of the discipline; and it is, perhaps, more dwelt upon by our author than is needful or desirable. We will, therefore, without further delay, proceed to the consideration of the stations enumerated above.

The first station is thus described in the Canon of St. Gregory:—"Weeping, or mourning, (*fletus seu luctus*) is without the gate of the oratory, where the sinner must stand praying the faithful, as they enter, to intercede for him." From this description, it is clear that the station of the *Fientes* was out of the church; which, indeed, St. Basil states, in the 56th Canon, where he says, "For four years he must weep, standing out of the oratory."

And Morinus (*book ix. cap. 2.*) asserts, that in all ancient baptismal churches, there was a space between the temple and its vestibule, in which was the station of the *Fientes*.

It appears from St. Gregory and St. Basil, that in this degree the penitents were principally bound to two things: 1st, to confess their sins publicly; and 2dly, to beg the faithful to pray for them. Here we find the humiliation of a public confession combined with the first station of penance.

But some authors have held this degree to be not a station of penance, but rather a mode of praying to be admitted to penance, which they were not bound to continue for any fixed period, until the times of Novatus;\* and Dr. Marshall countenances that opinion, for he says, speaking of the times before Montanus and Novatus,

---

\* Van Espen, *ubi sup.* §§ 18, 22. *Op. omn. tom. ii. p. 178.*

"Though such as desired to return into the Church by the door of penance, might stand at the church-porch entreating with tears to be admitted further, yet that station does not then appear to have been formally assigned to them as a part of their penitential labours."—P. 51.

The second station, that of hearers, is described by St. Gregory Thaumaturgus to be within the gate *in narthece*, which Van Espen explains to be within the gate of the church, or of the portico annexed to the church. There the sinner is to remain until the catechumens, and then go out. "For after hearing the Scriptures and the teaching, he is cast out as unworthy of praying."

The exercises of penitence in this station were, to hear diligently the reading of Scripture and its explanation, that is to say, the sermon. There was no imposition of hands on those who were in this station, excepting once, when they were admitted to it, and no prayers over them. They were, moreover, not compelled to any penal labours.\* And the privilege of hearing they shared with heathens, heretics, and Jews.

The third degree or station was that of *substratio*, or prostration, of which the canon of Thaumaturgus says, "*Subsectio autem seu substratio est, ut intra portam templi stans cum catechumenis egrediatur.*"

"Prostration (says Dr. Marshall), both before and after the time of Novatus, was all along regarded as the chief station of penance, wherein the sin of the delinquent was understood to be expiated. Accordingly, we meet in the writings of the Fathers with frequent mention of the severities and rigours which were imposed upon him. Whatever, indeed, we have of that kind represented to us in ancient authors, does usually refer to this, and to this station only; because, as I have more than once already suggested, the rest were considered as rather preparatory to, than as parts of penance, which though designed as a punishment, was in order to a privilege, and as such was sued for with great importunity.

"The Council of Carthage, so lately cited, directs the minister of penance to assign it to such as humbly begged it, without respect of persons. They could not communicate until they had passed through it; and that was the reason why they so humbly begged that they might be admitted to it. They did not apprehend themselves to be fully in the Church until they might partake of its ordinances, and it was then an undisputed maxim that no man was a Christian that was not in the Church; let his teaching abilities be what they would, his eloquence and philosophy be ever so great, yet if he broke the bond of charity and christian unity, he was judged to have lost whatever of privilege he once might have claimed as a member of the Church; and when that was once lost, and he was duly ejected out of it, there was no salvation to be expected for him. So St. Cyprian.†

\* Van Espen, ubi sup. § 23, &c.

† Cyprian ad Antonian. Ep. 55. Fell. p. 11. Cyprian. ad Pomponium. Ep. 4, Fell. p. 9.

"And yet this discipline, how much soever the zeal of those times might induce people to desire coming under it, was in reality very severe and rigorous; not only in the church, and in the time of worship, their behaviour and posture were to manifest their sorrow, but out of it likewise they were to express the same in the whole course and tenour of life and conversation.

"Origen well tells us that the hardships were very great which a man must submit to, who should not be discouraged by regards of shame from opening his case to the minister of God, and from seeking relief at his hands, that, according to that of the Psalmist, he must water his couch with his tears, and that they must be his meat both day and night.\*

"Tertullian, where he would rather diminish than magnify the rigours of Church discipline, does yet bear testimony to it; so that what comes here from him, is to be considered as coming from an unwilling witness, who would rather have chosen to conceal than to acknowledge it. Yet even he (whilst as a Montanist he ridicules it as insignificant) confesses it to be very rigorous. 'They sit,' he says, speaking of the penitents, 'in sackcloth, they are covered with ashes; they entreat with sighs, and groans, and bended knees, their common mother.' And again, 'the adulterer is brought into the congregation, to supplicate the brotherhood in form of a penitent, covered with sackcloth and ashes, under all imaginable circumstances of confusion and disgrace, before the widows and presbyters of the Church, forcing tears from every one, prostrate before their feet, and thus beseeching their compassion.†

"The same author elsewhere acquaints us with the hardships attending the public exhomologesis, the confession and humiliation of the prostrate penitent. 'It extends,' he says, 'its rigour even to its garb and diet, and to lay him in sackcloth and ashes; it obliges him to neglect all dress and ornament; to afflict his soul with melancholy meditations, and to reverse, by a quite contrary behaviour, his former misbehaviour. As to meat and drink, to use none for pleasure, but merely for sustenance; to keep up the fervours of his piety with frequent and assiduous fastings; to groan and weep, and to cry unto the Lord his God both night and day; to prostrate himself before the presbyters of the Church, and to beg of the servants of God in the humblest postures that they would intercede for his pardon. All this the public exhomologesis requires the penitent to submit to."‡—Pp. 55—57.

In this station of prostration, the penitents were subjected to frequent imposition of hands, accompanied by the prayers of the priests, adapted to the situation of the persons for whom they were offered. It formed, indeed, a course of penitence in itself, comprehending, 1st, humiliation and self-denial; 2dly, the constant and systematic pursuit of practices calculated to give a tendency to the mind towards a good and virtuous life; and 3dly,

\* Origen. in Levitic. cap. 3. Homil. 2. ed. Bened. tom. ii. p. 191.

† Tertull. de Pudicit. cap. 5, 13. Tertull. in lib. de Pœnitent. cap. 9.

‡ Tertull. de Pœnit. cap. 9.

practices of devotion, with the assistance of the Church's prayers.

This discipline prepared the penitent for the fourth station, that of *consistentia*, which is thus defined in the Canon of Thaumaturgus:—"Congregatio sive consistentia est, ut cum fidelibus consistat et cum catechumenis non egrediatur: postremo est participatio sacramentorum."\*

In this station the penitent was entitled to be present at the prayers of the faithful from beginning to end, but his oblations were not received at the altar. He assisted *absque oblatione*, as we have seen it expressed in the case of Burgandus, in the decree of Gratian. He was also not allowed to communicate until he had completed this term of his probation.

The gradations of these four stations are remarkable. The first, *fletus*, was one of humiliation and supplication, in which the penitent was to show his earnest desire to be admitted to that discipline whereby his restoration to the Church was to be effected. The Church took no notice of him, but merely allowed him to remain a suppliant until he had shown himself fit to pass on to the next degree. The second, *auditio*, was a station of humiliation and instruction combined. The penitent was admitted thereto by imposition of hands, as a token that his supplications were heard, and that he was once more under the care of the Church; but he was reduced to the condition of the lowest class of catechumens, so far as instruction was concerned. He was required to go through the process of learning the principles of Christianity afresh. But he was also allowed to receive higher instruction by assisting at the teaching of the Church, that his mind might be prepared by salutary counsels for the more arduous duties of the next station. Prayer in the church was still denied to him. These two first stations were also calculated to lead the penitent on by degrees, not alarming him by sudden austerities, but preparing his mind to submit to what was to come.

In this way the penitent was introduced to the third and grand station of *prostration*, which was indeed severe and grievous. But he had the comfort of looking to the alleviation of his sufferings in the very next station, and he was moreover encouraged in his penance by the frequent prayers and the countenance of the Church, by imposition of hands.

The next station, *consistentia*, was one of refreshment after his toils, though still of humiliation, and conducted him into the Church by absolution.

Such were the general features of the four stations. But their duration was determined according to the nature of the case, and the bishops had a power of mitigating and modifying

\* Van Espen, *ibid.* §§ 34-36.

the rigour of penances, where the fervour, the life, and the devotion of the penitent, justified such an indulgence; this power of exercising clemency is set forth in the fifth canon of the Council of Ancyra, the twelfth canon of the Council of Nicea, and in the last of that of Constantinople, and in other places.\*

We come now to the absolution, which was the finishing branch of the ancient Church discipline.

Absolution seems to have originally consisted of two branches; the one respecting the *forum internum*, the conscience of the sinner; and the other relating to the *forum externum*, the regimen of the Church.

"The first of these (says our author) was instrumental to the pardon of sin, whilst the second relaxed the censure it lay under. The one interceded with God for the sinner's forgiveness, and the other declared him released from his ecclesiastical bond."—Pp. 68, 69.

With regard to the first, the Church acts through the ministry of the priest in the office of intercessor, and declares the absolution of the sinner conditionally, though judicially. And here we must observe, that Dr. Marshall seems to us to dwell too much on the texts of the Fathers to the effect that God alone remits sins, so that he appears to throw too much into the back ground the judicial authority exercised in absolution, even in the internal forum. That judicial authority is clearly implied in the words of Scripture, giving the power to bind and to loose, and declaring that the acts performed on earth in the exercise of that power, shall be ratified in heaven; although, in the words of St. Ambrose, cited by Dr. Marshall,—

"God alone forgiveth sins. The Holy Spirit doth it, and the part which men bear in this action of forgiveness, is only applying their ministry to it, not exercising any direct authority, for they remit sins, not in their own, but in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. They intercede, but the Deity confers the gift."†—P. 71.

It is clear that the priest could not positively and absolutely remit sins, unless he could see the heart of the sinner. He cannot, therefore, exercise any direct authority, even in God's name. But St. Ambrose in this passage says, that the priest *remits sins* in the name of the Trinity; and St. Ambrose thereby clearly recognises the judicial part of absolution, and does not reduce it to mere intercession. And as for the precatory form of absolution used in the early Church, it is undoubtedly perfectly reconcilable with these principles.

Our author is more precise as to absolution respecting the *forum externum*:—

\* Van Espen, *ibid.* § 37, &c. Op. omn. tom. ii. pp. 181, 182.

† St. Ambr. de Spirit. Sanct. lib. iii. cap. 18, (p. 693, ed. Bened. vol. ii.)



"But in the *forum externum*, the outward regimen of the Church, the priest appears in another character, and performs the part of a judge in commission from Christ, since his restoration of the penitent to the peace of the Church and to outward visible communion is an authoritative judicial act, which he performs directly and properly in his own person, and the Church is obliged to own what he does as good and valid. St. Cyprian thought an act of the priest in this part of his office so authentic, that he held for valid even an irregular absolution, and would not attempt to rescind a sentence which had once been passed (how imprudently soever) by a priest of the Most High God."\*—P. 72.

This distinction between the two forums is very important with reference to the penitential discipline, for the sinner might after all obtain the benefit of only the latter branch of the absolution.

"This is what Augustine referred to when he cautions his people against contemning the penitential discipline, because they might observe perhaps some approaching to the Holy Communion whom they might suspect, or know, to be guilty of heinous crimes. Inasmuch as though it might be true that they were so, yet no proof was made of it; and we, says he, can restrain no one from our communion except he voluntarily confesses, or he be arraigned and convicted before some either secular or ecclesiastical judge, inasmuch as it was unfit for the same person to be both accuser and judge."†—P. 73.

The penitent might be readmitted into the outward communion of the Church without obtaining remission of his sins; and thus it must not be imputed to the ancient Church that it held the penitential discipline in itself sufficient to restore the sinner to the condition of a good Christian. The Church never encouraged such an error, which is a pure invention of those who wish to malign it, and lead men to the rejection of the doctrines and discipline of the Catholic Church.

"The restoration to communion did indeed presuppose the sin which it was applied to pardoned through the intercessions of the priest, and the mortifications which the penitent underwent throughout the whole course of the preceding discipline, since, when the time assigned him for penance was passed, he seems immediately to have taken the place he stood in among the faithful before his separation. So that his sin was gradually expiated by the deprecations of the minister of God throughout the whole course of his continuance under a state of penance, and it was judged to be fully expiated when the term of his sentence was expired, and therefore, upon his receiving for the last time imposition of hands from the bishop, he was immediately reinstated in all the privileges of full communion . . . Pacian hath answered for us an objection, which might arise as to the pardon of sin procured by the priest's intercession, and the consequent admission

\* Cyp. in Epist. [64, Fell. p. 158.]

† Augustine, in Hom. ult. ex. 50. cap. [10, ed. Bened. vol. v. p. 948.]

of the penitent to communion, which was then esteemed to carry with it the pardon of sin, because it first supposed and then declared it.

"You will object, says he, that God only can thus forgive sin. True, but the power of the priest is in this case the power of God; for what else is meant by the power of binding and loosing? I confess, indeed, that pardon is not to be granted to any on penance until there is some reason to guess at the will of God concerning them; and even then, it is not to be granted but upon mature deliberation, after great evidences of contrition and sorrow on their parts; after much intercession of God for them; and even then to be given with such a reserve as not to prejudge the sentence of the supreme Judge."\*—Pp. 73—75.

The same principles are laid down by Hooker:—"Now, albeit we willingly confess with St. Cyprian, *the sins which are committed against Him He only hath power to forgive who hath taken upon Him our sins, He which hath sorrowed and suffered for us, whom God hath given for our offences.* Yet neither did St. Cyprian intend to deny the power of the minister, otherwise than if he presume beyond his commission to remit sin, where God's own will is it should be retained; for against such absolutions he speaketh (which being granted to whom they should have been denied, are of no validity); and if rightly it be considered how higher causes in operation use to concur with inferior means, His grace with our ministry, God really performing the same which man is authorized to act as in His name, there shall need for the decision of this point no greater labour."†

But we need dwell no longer on these doctrines, a further investigation of which would lead us into controversy. After treating the whole subject of the penitential discipline as we have seen, Dr. Marshall proceeds to show the departure of the Western Churches from the primitive model in three chief particulars:—1. The substitution of private for public penance. 2. The redemption of the public by pecuniary and other commutations. 3. The separation of the two jurisdictions from each other, which were originally lodged in the same hands, and proceeded together with equal pace; *viz.* 1, that which respected the conscience of the sinner, and the forgiveness of his sin; and that, 2, which referred to outward discipline, and to the privilege of Church communion.

These heads we shall endeavour to treat briefly.

The rigorous practice of public penance, though in accordance with the zeal of the early ages, was difficult to reconcile with the habits and feelings of the world, and it may seem remarkable that that discipline should have been preserved in vigour during the first four centuries. And the passages cited by our author from Tertullian, Pacian, and St. Augustine, show that the

\* Pacian, in Epist. i. ad Sympronian. §§ 6, 7.

† Hooker, Eccles. Polit. b. vi. p. 358.

clergy had some difficulty in keeping it alive so long.\* But the first legislative breach in the ancient form of discipline was made by Pope Leo, in the year 440, who allowed private confession to a priest to be a substitute for the public exhomologesis, "for fear of driving many from the advantages of penance who might either be afraid or ashamed of letting their enemies into a knowledge of their guilt, and of exposing themselves thereby to the edge of the laws." But this constitution respected only secret offences, for as to notorious sins which caused public scandal, and especially the three famous instances of them, *viz.*, idolatry, uncleanness, and bloodshed, Leo was still of opinion that they were to be expiated by public discipline.† Gregory the Great, who entered his pontificate A. D. 590, laboured to restore the enfeebled discipline of the Church. He however found it necessary to recommend great care and art in rebuking sinners publicly, unless their transgressions were notorious. And thus we find the penitential discipline becoming gradually very different from what it was in the more simple and zealous days of the early Church.

We must, however, take care not to condemn the rulers of the Church for this change. Matters of discipline are not immutable as matters of faith are, unless they be expressly or constructively laid down by immutable divine law; and the government of the Church must at all times be so adapted to the circumstances of the world, as to produce the greatest edification and spiritual advantage to its children, having regard to the ultimate object and end of that government. So, though the principles of the Church's institutions are immutable, yet the forms of those institutions are, in many particulars, subject to change; a most important distinction, which is wisely and profoundly explained in the third book of the Ecclesiastical Polity.

With regard to the practice of confession to the priest, which almost entirely superseded the public exhomologesis, it was not decided to be absolutely obligatory in the time of Gratian, for we find in the Decree a collection of conflicting authorities on this question, and Gratian affords no solution of the difficulty.‡ But confession was afterwards positively enjoined by the canon *omnes utriusque sexus* of the Fourth Council of Lateran, held under Innocent III., in the years 1215-16. We must refer our readers to Dr. Marshall's book for the full details of the alterations which in the course of time took place in the discipline of penance, the chief features of which we have sketched out, and proceed to the redemption of public canonical penance for money, and other commutations.

This change arose out of the discretionary power which, as

\* Penit. Discip. p. 101, &c.

† Ibid. pp. 104-107.

‡ De Pœnit. Dist. i.

we have seen, the Council of Nicea, and, a little before, that of Ancyra, had entrusted to the bishops of relaxing the sinner's penance, and shortening the time he should continue under it. Whether or no this practice was introduced by our Archbishop Theodorus in the seventh century, we cannot stop to inquire, but it had certainly grown up to a grievance, and was complained of, fifty years after his death, in the council of Cloveshoe, held in the year 747. That it is dangerous, and greatly subject to abuse, will not be denied; and that it has been grossly abused is matter of history; yet it may appear unreasonable that the ecclesiastical judge should not be permitted to inflict a pecuniary penalty, though in doing so great care must be taken to avoid the possibility of the suspicion of a desire for lucre.\*

We come now to the separation of the two jurisdictions, which we have seen were for the first eleven centuries lodged in the same tribunal, *i.e.* the internal and the external.

That separation commenced in the twelfth century: it was produced partly by the increased duties which the enlargement and power of the Church cast upon the bishops, and partly by the intricacy and bulk of the canon law, which required for its administration men unencumbered with other functions and occupations.†

"The schoolmen had introduced a way of thinking and distinguishing, which involved and perplexed the canon law, whose bulk of itself was a growing burthen, and very likely to employ the ability and study of any man who would pretend to make himself a master of it; so that, all these circumstances concurring, the ecclesiastical court, which heretofore consisted of the bishop and his presbyters, came thus to be devolved upon some person whom the bishop thought fit to substitute, for hearing and determining all matters of ecclesiastical cognizance; which, by the piety of divers Christian emperors, from the first famous Constantine downwards, were grown to be very numerous and extensive. These emperors thought, that by deferring so much to the judgment of the bishops, and by granting appeals to them, they should, by the increase of their power, procure also for them an increase of respect and reverence."—P. 136.

The effect of this change was, that the whole of the contentious jurisdiction of the Church came to be administered in the exterior forum, and also parts of the voluntary jurisdiction; while the remainder of the voluntary jurisdiction, and especially the portion thereof belonging to penitential discipline, was left to the interior forum. And thereby the distinction between the two branches of excommunication and absolution—the internal and the external, became more evident; we say of ex-

\* See in the Decretals, cap. 13. tit. De Officio Jud. Ordina. Cap. 3. tit. De Pœnis; and Covarruvias, Variar. Question. lib. ii. cap. 9, § 9.

† Van Espen, pars iii. tit. iv. cap. 1, § 19; tom. iv. p. 111.

communication and absolution, because a distinction in one must manifestly produce a distinction in the other.

The consequence of that distinction was, that it was held by Aquinas, that the external jurisdiction to excommunicate and absolve, which does not directly but accidentally open the key of heaven, by the medium of Church communion, could be delegated to a person not having the key of order.\* It must, however, be observed, that the object of the two forums is the same — bringing the offender to repent and amend, and to cleanse his conscience by the means which the Church affords to her children. The exterior forum has a more immediate reference to the order and external peace of the Church, but still its main end is medicinal, and has reference to the conscience, so that it is held by the canonists, that excommunication is never to be inflicted where its probable effect will be rather to harden than to heal the offender.† And lest the reader should be led into error by some ambiguous expressions in the part of Dr. Marshall's book which we are considering, it is necessary to explain that the canonists do not understand Aquinas as making any distinction as to the effect of excommunication by the ecclesiastical judge in the external forum, and that of the excommunication by the ecclesiastical judge in the forum of penance, but as holding the power to excommunicate to belong to jurisdiction and not to order, whence he deduces that it may be held by a person not having order, provided he has jurisdiction;‡ which jurisdiction, however, he can only hold from the Church by a species of delegation. Our author expresses himself so as to give rise to an impression that by the canon law a mere layman was held capable of excommunicating. He cites these words of St. Thomas Aquinas: "*Quia excommunicatio non directe respicit gratiam, etiam non sacerdotes, dummodo jurisdictionem in foro contentioso habeant, possunt excommunicare.*"§ Now, excommunication does not directly regard grace, because it only cuts off the offender from the Church, and then, *per accidens*, he is deprived of grace if the sentence be just. So absolution does not directly regard grace, because it only renders the person capable of grace, and does not actually confer it or convey it. But excommunication does directly operate to exclude the person excommunicated from the outward communion of the Church: it directly operates so far as it regards the outward economy and government of the Church. And this is matter of jurisdiction, and not of order. But it indirectly operates so far as regards grace. That is the meaning of St. Thomas. The consequence is, that a person not having the keys of order,

\* Penit. Discipl. p. 139.

† Covarruvias, Op. om. tom. i. p. 318, § 13.

‡ Covarruvias, Op. om. tom. i. p. 363. § 1. et ubi cit. Panorm. et Hostiens. &c.

§ Penit. Discipl. p. 139. Tho. Aquin. in sum. Theolog. Supplem. 3 part. in Quest. 22.

that is to say, a person not a priest, may, by representation, be invested with the power of excommunication *in foro exteriori*. But it does not follow that a layman, that is to say, a person having no order, can lawfully exercise that power; that is to say, can lawfully have that power conveyed to him. And this the canon law denies.\* The reason is, that by the canon law, the laity cannot intermeddle with spiritual things;† and excommunication principally regards spiritual jurisdiction.

This explanation of the Canon Law was necessary, in order to enable the reader to judge for himself of the accuracy of Dr. Marshall's argument at p. 140, that the bishops in early ages did, in some instances, devolve this office on deacons,—therefore they might have vested it in a mere layman. The answer to this argument is, that the question is as to the capacity of the person to receive the office. No doubt the deacon had no more power *suo jure*, and of his own commission as a deacon, to exercise this power than a layman; but the question is, whether the layman is capable of holding the commission from the ordinary, because the deacon is so capable. Now the deacon is a spiritual person in holy orders, who may do many things which a layman cannot do; and, therefore, it seems that such a conclusion is by no means clearly deducible from the premises. But in the Church of Rome and the Eastern churches a man may be a spiritual person, though not a deacon, nor even a sub-deacon. Such a person, however, is a person set apart by the Church for spiritual functions, and capable of them; and is, therefore, by no means on the footing of a layman.

The same principles apply to absolution. A judge not having the key of order may, by virtue of that of jurisdiction, dissolve the vinculum of excommunication, quoad the exterior forum, which *accidentally* operates in the internal forum, but cannot directly remit sin, which belongs to the interior or penitential forum.‡ He may dissolve the vinculum of excommunication to all intents and purposes, because that dissolution concerns grace only indirectly, provided he has the key of jurisdiction. Thus absolution is not sacramental, and it belongs not to order, but to jurisdiction.§

We will no longer dwell on these difficult and abstruse doctrines, the general principles of which have, we hope, been

\* Covarruv. Op. omn. p. 368, § 3.

† See in the Decretals, lib. i. tit. i. de Judiciis, cap. 2; tit. Constitut. cap. 10; and in the Decree C. Bene quidem. C. si Imperator. C. si duo. Distinct. 96.

‡ Covarruv. Op. omn. p. 371, § 10. And in the Decretals the text *Canonica*, tit. de Sentent. Excommun., and *a nobis eod. tit.*

§ Ibid. § 10, et ibi cit. Cardinal. It is worth while to warn the reader that Hostiensis (Henricus de Suza) holds that a person not having the key of order can absolve *only in foro exteriori*; but Cardinalis (Zabarella, Abp. of Florence) holds that jurisdiction alone is sufficient to absolve in both forums. These two high authorities may be reconciled in great measure.



made intelligible; although they are rendered somewhat obscure by the conflict of very high authorities, and the nice distinctions drawn by them.

We may conclude that the practical effect of the separation of the outward forum from that of penance, was rather to make a distinction of causes on matters on which jurisdiction was exercised, than of the branches of the jurisdiction itself. Thus contentious causes naturally passed to the jurisdiction in the external forum; while the voluntary jurisdiction over penitents applying to the Church for spiritual relief, fell to the province of the penitential forum.

It would be curious and useful to trace the operation of the causes and effects which have produced the decay of both forums in our Church,—reducing the spiritual courts to a total neglect and dormancy of the true penitential character of their criminal jurisdiction, and shrinking the internal and strictly penitential forum to a very small compass indeed,—but such a task would far exceed our limits; we must, therefore, content ourselves with general principles and results.

It may be questioned whether our author is well founded in treating the separation of the forums as an abuse: it has much of convenience, and involves in itself no violation of principles. The bishops are necessarily, in modern times, too much oppressed with business to hold all their functions in one hand; they must, therefore, entrust some portions of those functions to others. Now there is great authority, and still greater reason, for holding that judicial forms of proceeding, regularly instituted and carried on by fixed rules and principles, are as conducive to the good administration of justice in the spiritual as in the temporal forum. It must follow that there is great advantage in placing the administration of the spiritual jurisdiction, *in foro contentioso*, in the hands of persons experienced and learned in the forms and principles of administering justice; but we must admit the danger of the administration of spiritual justice falling into the hands of mere lawyers, and thus being reduced to the condition of our own ecclesiastical courts. And here we have an instance of the mischief arising from the neglect of the reasons and principles of ecclesiastical public law. These institutions have been separated from the doctrines on which they are founded, and of which they are the practical machinery: they are one of the modes of practically applying the power of the keys. But this is forgotten,—the whole history of which we have given a sketch is forgotten,—and they are reduced to a mere existence by sufferance, as old obsolete forms, which are only allowed to exist because an outcry cannot be raised sufficiently powerful to effect their abolition. They are only supported by the influence of the proctors and country attorneys in the House of Commons. Their relation to the Church is little more than nominal; and the law is administered

in them in the same spirit, and with the same views, that govern the temporal magistrates in the administration of the secular laws of the state.

We will now proceed to the last Chapter of Dr. Marshall's book, in which he inquires whether the revival of the primitive discipline may be practicable, and how far it may be so.

In treating this very important part of his subject, our author seems to us constantly oppressed with the weight of the obstacles which prevent anything really effectual being done. He seems harassed and distressed on the one hand by the great things which he would do, because he sees them to be requisite, and on the other, by the smallness of the remedies which he is compelled to propose for such great defects and evils.

We must acknowledge our inability to point out any effectual remedy for those evils in the present state of the Church and of society. Ecclesiastical laws of discipline cannot, like secular laws, be enacted and enforced, whether they are understood and their purpose realized by the people or not. They must have a hold on the consciences of the people; they must be realized by those who are to be benefited by them, or otherwise they will degenerate into mere regulations of form, or become a dead letter.

Now the minds of men are unsettled in our Church as to the very first principles of ecclesiastical discipline. The very nature of the Episcopal office, from which all discipline flows, is but little understood. In practice, that office is reduced almost entirely to the mere exterior regulation of the clergy, and the management of property, and the performance of the rites which can only be performed by a bishop. And all these functions are hedged round with a triple fence of acts of Parliament.

But let us return to our author. He first recommends the enforcing of the present laws respecting discipline, especially with regard to the exclusion of notorious offenders from the Holy Communion; and on that head there can be no difference of opinion. He also recommends that some brand be fixed on the practice of joining in other parts of public worship, and departing without the reception of the Sacrament.\* He also suggests that communicants should have some separate place assigned to them, distinct from those who do not communicate. These two last suggestions, and the reflections with which Dr. Marshall propounds them, are very deserving the careful consideration of the Bishops; yet we fear that, in the greater number of cases, it would be almost impossible to enforce such regulations.

---

\* See Canon 2 of the Council of Antioch. "*Omnes qui ingrediuntur Ecclesiam Dei, et Scripturas sacras audiunt, nec communicant in oratione cum populo, sed pro quadam intemperantia se a perceptione sanctæ Communionis averrunt, hi de ecclesia removeantur, quamdiu per confessionem pœnitentiæ fructus ostendant et precibus indulgentiam consequantur.*"

Dr. Marshall next recommends that the key of jurisdiction be reunited to that of order.

On this head he recommends what has been carried into effect by the Stat. 53 Geo. III. ch. 127,—namely, that excommunication should not be used for the mere purpose of dealing with contumacious parties in the Ecclesiastical Courts; a practice which produced scandal, and was used in such a manner as to pervert the censures of the Church to the mere secular office of legal process.

As for the recommendation to unite the two keys in one hand, we have already shown that there is great reason to doubt its expediency. We have shown that there is a part of the Church's jurisdiction which cannot be better exercised than in a judicial form, and by judges qualified by education and experience for the administration of justice. The only thing to be guarded against is the secularization of the spiritual courts; and here we must acknowledge that the present state of our Ecclesiastical Courts is very bad. The law is well administered in some of them, but they are spiritual courts only in name. The lawyers who preside in them are, for the most part, mere laymen, and the courts themselves are completely secularized. The true foundation of their jurisdiction and the object of their institution are in practice quite obsolete; and no distinction is drawn between the secular and the spiritual part of their authority. Instead of holding himself as the instrument of the exercise of the keys of jurisdiction,—the *alter ego* of the bishop in the exterior forum,—and the depository of a portion of the authority vested in the Church by Divine power, the ecclesiastical judge esteems himself no more than a magistrate entrusted with the administration of the Queen's ecclesiastical law; the consequence is that justice is administered in those courts solely with reference to the exterior forum, and the temporal law is by them always preferred to the spiritual law. And this state of things is being daily rendered worse by the new court of appeal—the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Only one ecclesiastical judge is necessarily a member of that court, which is composed of judges, and persons who have been judges, of the courts of common law and equity. And indeed our readers must remember a great case being decided in the Judicial Committee, involving the question of the validity of lay, or rather of dissenters',\* baptism, by a body of lay lawyers, without the presence of a single ecclesiastic;—by Lord Brougham, Lord Wynford, Mr. Justice Erskine, and Sir J. Lushington sitting as judge of the Admiralty. The consequence of this is that the spiritual courts naturally endeavour to rely in their judgments on the decisions

\* We draw this distinction, because the judgment assumed the identity of the two: that the Western Church admits *lay* baptism, there can be no question, but no connexion has been established between lay baptism in, and of, the Church, and dissenters' baptism in spite of the Church.

and principles of the secular courts, because they know that those decisions and principles will have the greatest weight in the Court of Appeal. They know that among a board of common lawyers any approach to abstract principles of ecclesiastical law would meet with very little respect, and that the authority of councils, ecclesiastical writers, theologians, schoolmen, and the sages of the civil and canon law, would not be allowed to weigh against a decision of Lord Eldon, or Lord Tenterden. They therefore even prefer analogies drawn from cases out of the term reports or Vesey Junior, to the direct sanctions of well-established principles of the civil and canon law. The necessary tendency of this state of things is, that unless a remedy be applied, the science of ecclesiastical jurisprudence will soon be extinct among us.

But these are no reasons to take the keys of jurisdiction from the Ecclesiastical Courts. It is better to reform than to destroy. There is no reason to suppose that the science of ecclesiastical jurisprudence cannot be revived in this country. Indeed the clergy are daily opening their eyes to the importance of that branch of learning. There is a daily increase of the demand for information on that subject, and the time may not be far distant when our venerable universities, especially that of Oxford, will take the lead in restoring to the Church that learning, without which her authority, laws, and institutions can neither be fully understood nor preserved from decay.

Whenever there shall be a body of clergy sufficiently learned in these matters,—and laymen able and willing to assist them with advice and labour,—it will not be difficult to restore the ecclesiastical jurisdiction to a solid and wholesome condition. Let us earnestly apply ourselves to this great and holy work. Let us all contribute so far as lies in our power to the restoration of this great and salutary branch of the Church's administration.

We cannot here refrain (although it is somewhat beside our subject) from exhorting those among our readers who are anxious for the revival of ecclesiastical synods to turn over in their minds whether those synods could be made to work safely or beneficially without the learning of which we have just been desiring the restoration.

What would our Parliaments be without that mass of law, and history, and experience, which form constitutional law, and parliamentary law? How have the new legislative assemblies in Spain, Portugal, and other countries been found to work without that jurisprudence? And how can any wise, and good, and solid results be hoped from the deliberations of an ecclesiastical senate, without learning in ecclesiastical constitutional law, and the written experience stored up by ecclesiastical legislators, statesmen, and judges? Would there be no danger in an ecclesiastical "*Parliamentum indoctum*?" But we will not engage our readers further in a digression.

The fifth recommendation of Dr. Marshall is more practically important than the others, inasmuch as it lies within the power of all the clergy individually: "That the interceding mediatorial office of the priest be by some fit method inculcated on the people, who by all means should acknowledge him in that capacity." All that our author says on this head is very well worth attentive perusal, but we must be content with one extract:—

"This I the rather mention because the notion seems to be quite sunk and lost, and all esteem of his office is made to centre in his personal accomplishments, and in his preaching abilities.

"Whereas the holy martyr Ignatius magnifies the public service of the Church, and the constitutions call the bishops (of whose office, in this point, priests or presbyters have a portion) the voice of God; mediators between God and his people; and Chrysostom gives this as an instance of the usefulness of the public Liturgy; that the prayers of the people were therein assisted by those of the priests, and ascended to heaven with the better success for going up in conjunction with theirs.

"St. Clement (Romanus) compares the part performed by the priest in his gospel ministrations to that which was performed by the priest under the Jewish economy, who made, we know, therein available intercessions for the transgressions of the people.

"This is indeed a very high and important office, which cannot in these days be too much magnified, when so many circumstances conspire to depress it, when it is consigned to the hands of our meanest performers, and is therefore considered and performed accordingly.

"The laity do generally, I fear, consider it as a mere reading over a form of prayer, which might as availably, and as well, be done by some person in the congregation as by him that officiates. They seldom look upon the man in the desk as any other than a mere stipendiary, not as an authorized intercessor to God and to Christ for them.

"My reverend brethren will not, I hope, misconstrue me if I press upon them a serious endeavour to assert the honour of their mediatorial office between Christ and the souls of their people, by suffering none to act for them in this part of their function, but such as know how to sustain the province with decency and authority; and thence are likely to infuse into their people a just sense of the honours due to it.

"The necessity of their own appearance in the pulpit may plead in some cases a pretty just apology for their absence at that time from the desk, and for their providing it with a proper substitute. But it is high time to be careful in this provision; and that every person who can *read* the prayers, should not thence be judged fit to *offer* them; but such a one only as is sensible of the honour to which that station entitles him, and knows how to preserve, and to increase, the esteem which is due to it."—Pp. 171, 172.

There has been a great improvement lately in this respect, but nevertheless Dr. Marshall's admonitions are worth remem-

bering; and the more so because the way in which the service is usually performed, *i.e.* from a *reading-desk*, or *reading-pew*, has a natural tendency to produce that opinion which our author so gravely and so soundly combats. There is nothing in that way of celebrating divine worship to remind people of *offering* prayers, and everything to make them consider the office of the priest to be that of *reading* prayers. This renders it more especially necessary that they should be taught to have some regard to the sacerdotal character of the clergy in the celebration of divine worship.

The sixth and last recommendation of Dr. Marshall is the revival of the office of the Chorepiscopi, or Suffragans. He recommends that one of those prelates be appointed in some market-town, or place of great resort, within each rural deanery; to whom should appertain the duties which anciently belonged to the Penitentiary, who represented the bishop in the forum of penance; and that the suffragan should be entrusted accordingly with the management of discipline in all the parts assigned to him for his province; yet with this restriction, that he should be subject and accountable to the bishop of his diocese, who, by this means, might be made fully acquainted with the state of his people.

Our author refers to a very remarkable statute, (the 26th Hen. VIII. c. 14,) appointing Suffragans—

“To be constituted in such places as are therein specified; and, moreover, empowering the bishop of every diocese to nominate two spiritual persons to the King’s Highness, for his choice and confirmation of one of them to be Suffragan to the said bishop, and to have such power and jurisdiction as should be specified in the commission granted to him by his bishop. And the King was to present the person so nominated and confirmed to the archbishop for his consecration.”—Pp. 177.

That statute is still unrepealed; and as this institution of Suffragans may therefore at any time be revived, without any application to Parliament, this subject is a matter of practical importance and interest. It undeniably bears a great outward show of plausibility and convenience, and we are far from saying that it may not be, upon the whole, desirable and expedient. There are, however, serious difficulties, which render the subject one of great doubt, and requiring most mature consideration.

In the first place, assuming that the Suffragans must be inferior prelates, not coordinate in authority with the Diocesan Bishops, there appears to be some danger of injuring the unity and harmony of the primitive polity of Episcopal government, by the appointment of more than one bishop in each bishopric; and it would be extremely difficult so to limit the authority of



the Suffragans as to prevent this danger arising. In the second place, there would be danger of diminishing the respect of the people for the Episcopal dignity by the great increase of the number of bishops, especially bishops with jurisdiction over comparatively small districts. And thus we find that the canon law requires that bishops' sees should only be in greater cities—*ne vilescat episcopalis dignitas*.\* These are grave considerations, but there are others also of great weight.

This institution of Chorepiscopi was pretty generally in use in the East as early as the fourth century. It was introduced somewhat later in the Western Church, and was there sooner abolished; but in both the Eastern and the Western Church it was abolished, having been found inconvenient. The Diocesan Bishops gradually permitted almost all their functions to be discharged by the Suffragans, to the great injury of their own office and jurisdiction, for which reason the appointment of those prelates was forbidden under Pope Leo III. and Charlemagne.†

The tenth Canon of the Council of Antioch shows that the Chorepiscopi had encroached on the jurisdiction of their diocesans, and thus injured the peace and order of the Church; and the laws by which their appointment was forbidden are grounded on the decay of the diocesan jurisdiction caused by those prelates.‡ We, however, carefully abstain from giving any opinion whether the revival of Suffragan Bishops in our Church would or would not be expedient. The subject is one well deserving careful and mature deliberation, and is very proper to be submitted to the Convocation; but we do not think the objections to this institution have been duly considered by those who have lately recommended its introduction in the Church of England.

We have now examined Dr. Marshall's very interesting and important treatise sufficiently at large to give the reader a general notion of its contents. We have endeavoured to do so in such a manner as to supply what our author required of general principles and arrangement, and at the same time to show as much as possible the grounds and reasons of ecclesiastical public law, on which the institutions of the Church are grounded with reference to Penitential Discipline.

We have not ventured to make any recommendations for the restoration of Discipline; but we have, perhaps, facilitated the researches of those who, by more profound and thorough investigation of this obscure and difficult subject, may discover at length the means of accomplishing what some of our greatest prelates have desired in vain.

\* Lossæi de Jur. Universitat. p. 34. And in the Decree of Gratian, Distinct. LXXX. Can. Episcopi.

† Fleuri, Institut. au Droit. Ecclés. tom. ii. p. 165.

‡ Van Espen, Schol. in Can. Antioch. Can. X. Op. omn. tom. vi. p. 503.

1. *Proceedings at the Ceremony of laying the Foundation Stone of King's College, Toronto, April 23, 1842; and at the opening of the University, June 8, 1843.* Toronto: 1843. Pp. 86.
2. *Toronto Patriot*, Nov. 17, and Dec. 5. 1843.

THE British colonies in North America must always have an interest for the true-hearted Englishman, were it only that they were in a great degree settled in their commencement by those who refused to join the standard of rebellion against the mother country,—when those more ancient colonies which now form the United States of America cast off their allegiance to her. And although the descendants of those first settlers at present form, numerically, but a small portion of the population,—yet it cannot be denied that they are looked up to with great respect by all the better portion of the present community, and form one of the strongest links to bind them to the British crown. It was a vast sacrifice they made when they renounced their all in the regularly organized states in the south, and came to a new land, where they had little but the forest and the soil to begin with, and where the lesser comforts and refinements of civilized life had to be dispensed with; or, if preserved at all, preserved with great difficulty and struggle. But besides comforts and refinements, which are not essential, there was one thing they lost, which was all but irreparable,—we mean, the power of educating their children. The revolted colonies were possessed (besides the ordinary schools, which increasing wealth and cultivation necessarily supplied) of several establishments of a higher character, under the designation of colleges, which supplied to the rising youth all that in a young country could be required to form the future physician, lawyer, or divine. The whole of this was lost; and many young persons were growing up, who must be indebted to their parents, struggling with all the difficulties and hardships of clearing the forest, and breaking up the untouched soil, and providing the very necessities of life,—or be sent to the institutions of the rebellious states, where their principles would be in great danger, or be altogether destitute of any literary cultivation whatever. This, it is true, would not be so much felt by the youth themselves; but it could not fail of being felt most acutely by many of the parents, who were persons of enlarged and cultivated minds,—and to whom, therefore, this would have been the most afflicting of all the sacrifices they had made, were there not another,—the loss of the blessings of the Christian ministry, with which nothing human can compare. The feeling of the vast importance of regular education was so strong, that not more than six years were suffered to elapse from the recognition of the United States by Great Britain in 1783, before measures were taken by

the colonial government for setting apart eligible portions of land for the future support of schools in all new settlements. The only way, however, in which lands could be available for educational purposes would be by their becoming occupied and cultivated; and as the settlers were not only few in number, but also thinly scattered, that measure continued unavailing for the purpose.

In 1793, the province of Quebec was divided into Upper and Lower Canada; and General Simcoe came out as lieutenant-governor of the upper province. There was, for a long time, too much to be done in extending settlements, exploring the country, and organizing the different departments necessary for carrying on the government, to have time to think of education; but in 1796 the governor found his attention happily called to the subject by a despatch from the Duke of Portland, then Secretary of State; and whilst he was anxiously revolving the best means of carrying the views of the home government into effect, the matter was taken up by the provincial legislature in their union of 1797, when they addressed a memorial to him on the subject. The two points aimed at by the memorial were the establishment of a respectable grammar-school in each district, and the founding of a college or university for completing the education of those who should wish to proceed farther than the grammar-schools could carry them. And for both these ends they prayed the appropriation of some of the waste lands of the crown. This was the first public mention of a university: and at so early a period there could have been but little idea of seeing it established. But these wise and good men did not think only of themselves: they desired that their posterity might enjoy advantages of which themselves were debarred; and from that time the subject has never been forgotten.

In this year General Simcoe was removed to a higher government: but he had forwarded the memorial to England; and in November of the same year an answer was received communicating the Royal intention to comply with its petition; and the lieutenant-governor, the Hon. Peter Russell, was directed to consult the executive council, together with the judges and law-officers of the crown, as to the best method of rendering the crown lands available for the purpose. These gentlemen accordingly drew up an able and elaborate report, in which they recommended that four grammar-schools should be erected, at the expense of 3000*l.* each, at Kingston, Cornwall, Niagara and Sandwich, for the four districts into which Upper Canada was then divided; and that an annual sum of 180*l.* each should be allowed for the salaries of the masters and for repairs. They likewise recommended the foundation of a university at York (now Toronto), which was then the seat of government, whenever the province should require such an institution. For each of

these purposes they suggested the appropriation of an equal portion of crown lands,—the whole amounting to half a million of acres.

The appropriation was made by the crown according to the recommendation of the commissioners; and it was intended that one half of the lands should in each instance be sold for setting the institutions on foot, and the other half reserved as a permanent endowment. On attempting, however, to commence the sale of lands by disposing of the township of Norwich, the small sum yielded by its alienation, owing to the facility with which the then government made gratuitous grants of land, convinced all parties concerned that the measure, however desirable in itself, could not by that means be accomplished: inasmuch as (at that period) the sale of the whole reservation would scarcely have furnished funds for the erection and maintenance of a single grammar-school. All further proceedings were therefore postponed, until the increase of population and growing settlements should render the lands more valuable.

Being disappointed in that direction, the friends of education turned their thoughts in another. In 1799, the Hon. Richard Cartwright, who ten years before had suggested to the then governor, Lord Dorchester, the pressing importance of the subject, together with the Hon. Robert Hamilton, (being both personally much interested in the matter, as having large families growing up), had obtained from General Simcoe, before he quitted the government, a promise that if they should procure a person, well qualified to teach, to settle at Kingston, a salary should be allowed for that purpose; and, on the strength of that promise, had sent to Scotland for a gentleman of that description. Their friends in Scotland sent out Mr. Strachan, then a student in the University of St. Andrew's, and now Bishop of Toronto;—to whom, as we learn from the language of the present Chief Justice of Upper Canada, in his Address at the opening of the university, "that province is more indebted than to any other individual within it, for improvements in education in every gradation and department."

The disappointment of the young student must have been sufficiently poignant, when he found, on his arrival in the colony to which he had expatriated himself, that the change of governors had produced a change of views; that the public institution of which he had trusted to be the first master was not to be; that no salary was to be expected from the government; and that, if he remained in the country, he must depend altogether on his own exertions and the aid of the friends who brought him out. This is only one of the disappointments to which individuals have been subjected, who have emigrated to that country on expectations held out to them in relation to education.

Mr. Strachan, however, did not despair. He was persuaded

by Mr. Cartwright to commence the work of education on his own account; and the first school in which any attempt was made to give a classical and mathematical education was opened in the house of that gentleman, the first pupils being his own children and those of Mr. Hamilton. The success of its conductor was equal to his determination and perseverance: and in 1803, when he entered into holy orders, and removed to his station at Cornwall in the adjoining district, he was enabled to carry most of his pupils with him. This school he continued to teach for nine years, during which it attained to a high degree of celebrity. Boys and young men came to it from all parts of both provinces, and nothing was at length wanting in it to complete such a system of education as the exigencies of the country then required. In short, among the then Mr. Strachan's pupils are to be numbered most of the leading native Canadians, and, in particular, most of the judges of Upper Canada.

During his residence at Cornwall, and ten years from the appropriation of the lands for the purposes of education, the legislature felt it their duty, from the funds at their disposal, to establish a school in each district, with a salary of 100*l.* currency to the master. The erection of a university was again agitated; but it appeared that there were no funds available for its sustentation, unless the plan of district schools should be abandoned; and indeed, from the low state of education in the province, it appeared hopeless to find young men in sufficient number qualified to profit by the higher pursuits of a university. The idea therefore was wisely laid up in store, in the hope that, in due time, the grammar-schools might become nurseries for a university, and that then it might be brought into operation. The principal schools established by means of this act of the legislature were those of Kingston, Cornwall, Niagara, Sandwich, York, and London. To Mr. Strachan was of course offered the direction of that established at Cornwall, which he accepted; and although the other grammar-schools naturally drew off such of his pupils as belonged to their respective districts, his talent and diligence still maintained its reputation; its numbers did not diminish, but, on the contrary, increased by the flocking in of pupils from Lower Canada.

The project of a university was now allowed to remain in abeyance for nearly twenty years: but that it was not lost sight of appears from the circumstance that in 1810, when a law was passed to increase the representation in the House of Assembly, it was provided, that whenever the university should be established, it should be represented by one member.

In 1812, the remarkable ability of Mr. Strachan having become known to Lieut.-Governor Brock, he induced him to remove to York, the seat of government, with the appointments of rector of the parish, military chaplain, and master of the

grammar-school; all together, however, yielding no more than an adequate income for the clergyman of so important a station. Here his sphere of usefulness became much enlarged. His talent for business and firmness of character became more conspicuous; and by being appointed in 1815 to a seat in the Legislative Council, he became possessed of the power of promoting the views which he every day more warmly cherished for the advancement of the cause of education. Accordingly we find in 1817 a bill introduced into the Legislative Council by the then Chief Justice, for modifying the whole system of education; and, as on former occasions, we observe that a part of the plan was a college, to which the youth should proceed from the district grammar-schools, and in which some of them should have assistance to support them whilst studying there. Again, in 1819 we find Mr. Strachan, as editor of a religious periodical which he then conducted, giving a history of education in Upper Canada, and pressing with various convincing arguments the establishment of a university; and what he thus promoted in public and by writing, no doubt he would forward elsewhere as opportunity offered. Indeed, in this year we learn from the same periodical that the subject of a university had engaged the attention of the Duke of Richmond, the governor-general of all the British provinces, and was probably only not practically entered upon in consequence of his premature death.

The greatest hindrance to the establishment of such an institution hitherto was the unproductiveness of the endowment. The government still continued to grant land gratuitously to all applicants capable of becoming useful settlers; and consequently there were few or no purchasers of the school and university lands. In 1823, during the government of Sir Peregrine Maitland, it occurred to Mr. Strachan to suggest a plan by which the endowment might be made available. The lands which had, at the first settlement of the province, been reserved to the Crown, and were still unalienated, had in many parts become valuable from the settlements around them, and if brought into the market would command a high price. He therefore proposed to Sir Peregrine Maitland to suggest to the government of King George the Fourth to consent to the exchange of a portion of the university and school lands for a like quantity of the crown reserves. For the mere purpose of granting lots to settlers, the education lands would be as useful to the government as the crown reserves; and thus, without injury to any one, there might be a hope of the university being speedily brought into operation. At that period likewise we find the first mention of the idea of a royal charter; for which, no doubt, Canada is indebted to the intelligent and sagacious promoter of the exchange. Whilst these discussions were going on, Mr. Strachan resigned the arduous duties of the district school upon being



appointed to the Archdeaconry of York, a dignity then first created. When the archdeacon's project had been duly considered, it appeared to Sir Peregrine Maitland to be worthy of his most cordial approbation; but not deeming it within his power to make the exchange without special instructions, and at the same time being desirous of obtaining a royal charter for the university,—perceiving likewise that local information and many explanations might be required, which could not be furnished in writing, he determined to commit to the author of the plan the agreeable task of proceeding in person to solicit the charter and endowment, for which purpose he left York for England in the spring of 1826.

The Archdeacon spent almost eighteen months in the mother country; for many delays arose in the construction of the charter, growing out of the peculiar circumstances of the country for which it was intended. Owing to the accidental way in which Upper Canada was peopled, and the great neglect of the government in not providing for the religious instruction of the people by clergy of the Church, the religious condition of the colony was very different from that of the mother country, and the mass of the people got their religion as they could. The result was, that they had either none at all, or that which was cheapest,—viz. the ministrations of various sectarian teachers, chiefly, we believe, from the neighbouring States. There was another point:—many of the earliest settlers had been from Scotland, and had had ministers sent out to them connected with the presbyterian establishment of that country. This class had become some of the most wealthy and respectable in the community; they were amongst the most influential members of the provincial parliament, and even in the legislative council: and whatever might have been done with regard to the other dissenting sects, it seemed impossible to overlook them in the scheme of a university, or to do otherwise than to leave it open to them; and if to them, of course to all denominations of Christians. Nay, more, it seemed probable that it was the wisest policy to admit them to the advantages of the university, as the best means of doing away with sectarian bias and bringing them into the bosom of the Church. Although, therefore, the plan of Archdeacon Strachan would have made all the governing members of the university clergymen or members of the Church of England, he thought it not only necessary to admit youth to the advantage of education and of degrees in art, law, and medicine, without requiring that they should conform to the Church, but likewise left open such of the professorships as were not held by members of the college council. This part of the plan no doubt appeared the less objectionable to him, inasmuch as it is practically acted upon in the Scottish universities; with this difference, that the governing body there is presbyterian.

The scheme, however, did not appear in the same point of view to persons of high station at home, especially to Dr. Sutton, then archbishop of Canterbury, who was anxious that the university should be based upon the same principles as those of England; partly, no doubt, by way of adhering to plans which worked so well in them, partly because he foresaw that an institution not grounded on one consistent principle must contain in it the seeds of intestine discord, and thence of weakness and decay. We think that the Archbishop's foresight was just, and (but this is forestalling) that experience has shown that the proposed plan, however apparently justified, and indeed required, by a positive necessity, was a practical mistake. That which might possibly work well in an institution which grants no degrees, could scarcely be carried on harmoniously for a long series of years, when large portions of the graduates would be members of the various sectarian denominations, and, being excluded from the governing body of the university, would feel themselves much more degraded by being of the university, and yet prevented from rising to its highest offices, than if they had never been admitted within its walls.

The Archdeacon, however, with the tact and perseverance which have always characterized him, and being assisted, in part, by persons at home, succeeded in carrying every material portion of his design, and returned to Canada—about thirty years after the first mention of a university—with authority for its endowment under the name of King's College, and with a charter "the most open that had ever been granted, and the most liberal (as was supposed) that could be framed upon constitutional principles." And yet such assurance was felt that the education communicated in it would be in conformity with the principles of the Church of England, that the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge voted the considerable sum of 500*l.* to purchase books in divinity, to be the foundation of a theological library.

During his absence, however, from the colony, the members of the adverse sects, aided by churchmen, who, from political motives, were opposed to the views of those in power, and especially of the Archdeacon,—whose very presence in the legislative council was to them a source of constant jealousy,—had been employed in poisoning the minds of the people, by calumnies and misrepresentations against the proposed charter; so that many petitions were sent up against it to the House of Assembly; rather, however, against what they supposed it to be, than against its actual provisions. The result was, that when the Governor, in 1828, announced it to the legislature, in his speech from the throne; although the legislative council received the announcement with grateful joy, the more popular branch evinced little but jealousy and distrust, and finally agreed to an address to the King, in which objections were urged

against it, as too exclusive. Unfortunately *liberal* principles were now prevailing to a great extent at home, and a select committee of the House of Commons, in the same year, advised so radical and violent a change in the constitution of the college council, as that no religious test should be required of its members; and such a confusion of all ideas of truth and error, as that two theological professors should be appointed conjointly, one of the Church of England and one of the Presbyterian Establishment of Scotland.

Meanwhile the short remainder of Sir P. Maitland's government was employed in pushing on the business of the university. The college council had been formed, and a minute and accurate inspection obtained of their whole property. As the lands could not *immediately* provide the necessary expenses of building, and none of them were in a suitable situation for the institution itself, an annuity of 1000*l.* sterling was obtained from the Government, out of the proceeds of lands sold to the Canada Company, and an eligible site was purchased in the vicinity of York; plans and specifications were under consideration, and everything portended the speedy commencement of the undertaking.

The new Governor, however, Sir John Colborne, who came out in the same year, took a very different view of the exigencies of the country from his predecessor. He adopted the views of those who thought the charter too exclusive, and was, moreover, of opinion that the country was not ripe for such an institution as a university. He therefore peremptorily refused to concur in any proceedings having for their object the founding of a university, until certain alterations were made in the charter; and he urged, instead, the enlargement of the plan of the Royal Grammar School, into which the district school of York had been changed, so as to embrace the whole province, and thus become a nursery for the university. His wishes on that head were acceded to by the college council, and large sums of money were expended in building a school-house and dwellings for the masters. The vice-chancellor of the university of Oxford was requested to select suitable persons for setting on foot the new institution, on the plan of the English public schools; and the Rev. Dr. Harris, as Principal, with other gentlemen as classical and mathematical masters, went out to Canada, for the purpose of opening and conducting it. It took the title of Upper Canada College, under which name it has flourished, with great benefit to the colony, to the present day; its second Principal having been Dr. John M'Caul, who had honourably distinguished himself at Trinity College, Dublin, where he occupied a position of considerable responsibility, as examiner in classical honours.

Liberal principles continuing to advance, both at home and in the colonies, other addresses were presented to the Lieutenant-

Governor, praying for various modifications of the charter of King's College; and in 1832, when the Whig government had been in office about two years, a despatch was received from the Home Government, and laid before the college council, actually proposing to the members of that corporation to surrender their charter and endowment, on the simple guarantee of the Secretary of State, that no part of the endowment should ever be diverted from the education of youth; grounding the demand on the fact that the charter had not yet been made effectual, but forgetting that it would have been so, but for the impediments thrown in the way by the Governor himself.

To the honour of the members of the then council, they altogether refused to surrender either their charter or their endowment, stating fully their objections so to do in an able and lucid report, in which we imagine we can perceive the style and tone of thought of the present Chief Justice Robinson, and which remonstrated, in a free and manly style, against the grounds taken by the Secretary of State in his despatch. They stated that "they could never stand excused to themselves or others, if they should surrender the charter, . . . so long as there was an utter uncertainty as to the measures that would follow;" and rested their refusal so to act on the importance of "a seat of learning in which sound religious instruction should be dispensed, and in which care should be taken to guard against those occasions of instability, dissension, and confusion, the foresight of which has led, in the parent state, to the making a uniformity of religion in each university throughout the empire an indispensable feature in its constitution."

To show, however, that they were desirous of complying with the wishes of the king's government so far as they conscientiously could, they suggested some alterations of the charter which they conceived desirable; which were as follows: 1st, that the Visitor, instead of being the Bishop of Quebec, might be the Court of King's Bench; 2dly, that the President should not necessarily be Archdeacon of York, but might be any other clergyman of the Church of England; 3dly, that the subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, required of members of the Council, should be changed to a declaration of being members of the Church of England; or, if the government thought it *indispensable*, that subscription should be altogether abolished; 4thly, that the qualifications for degrees in divinity, instead of being the same as those required in the university of Oxford, should be left to the arrangement of the college council. To the two first of these alterations we do not think there can be any material objection; indeed the second seemed altogether necessary: but it is with extreme regret that we perceive that the whole council, with the exception of the chief justice, were unanimous in assenting to the third and fourth, and that even he did not dissent from the

fourth. We most fully agree with him that "a college for educating youth in the principles of the Christian religion, as well as in literature and the sciences, is less likely to be useful and to acquire a lasting and deserved popularity, if its religious character is left to the discretion of individuals and to the chance of events, and suffered to remain the subject of unchristian intrigues and dissensions, than if it is laid broadly and firmly in its foundation by an authority which cannot with any reason be questioned;" and we are of opinion that these remarks apply as completely to the subject of degrees in divinity as to the other point of the qualification. We regret to be obliged to say, that we view the concessions then offered by the council, with the archdeacon at its head, as absolutely fatal and suicidal; and it gives us deep pain that any considerations of expediency, how constraining soever in appearance, should have induced that venerable person to give the slightest hint of concurrence in a principle, so fatal in its unavoidable consequences to the religious unity, the moral character, and the unity of action of the university. It is very true, that there was great danger, considering the character of the then home government, that the strong arm of power might be exerted to annul the charter altogether. It is true that it must have been difficult to stand all but alone against the apparent feeling of the whole colony: but we think that it would have been far better that the whole institution should have been subverted (if subverted it must have been) by a tyrannical exercise of power, from whatever quarter it might come, than that any clergyman should have concurred in expressing even a reluctant assent to so pernicious a proposition.

It is not perhaps surprising, after such a concession, in whatever way extorted, that the committee of the House of Assembly, upon its next meeting, should have felt encouraged to proceed in its aggressions both upon the university and upon Upper Canada College. Not, however, that we mean to imply that every thing which they proposed was injurious. We perfectly agree, for instance, that for that college to continue a separate institution, whilst dependent for support upon the university, was an anomaly which needed rectifying; and that its incorporation with the university was both wise and necessary. But there was evidently a spirit of restless meddling abroad, which would not cease its efforts whilst any institution remained which could have a tendency to attach its dependents to the habits and feelings of the parent country, or hold an independent line of conduct, apart from the influence of political party and intrigue. It assumed the garb of simple opposition to the exclusiveness of "the family compact;" but in reality it was swayed by a *principle*, and that principle the desire to bring every thing whatever within the colony under the dominion of a majority of the House of Assembly.

To the party governed by this spirit Sir John Colborne gave the reins, so far as lay in his power, when, in the session of 1833, having received the sanction of the home government to placing the modification of the charter in the hands of the colonial legislature, he announced this fact in his opening speech, and invited the legislature to alter it; promising that his Majesty would give effect to whatever changes might be agreed upon. How *any* ministers of the British crown could have brought themselves to authorize so flagrant a violation of the royal prerogative as that a colonial legislature, or any legislature, should alter a royal charter, is to us inconceivable. Strange to say, after this nothing whatever was attempted for two years: but in 1835, the House of Assembly, encouraged no doubt by the spirit which they saw more and more prevalent in the home administration, sent up a bill to the upper house, the provisions of which are absolutely astounding. It totally removed the *royal* influence from a college founded and endowed by the crown, and placed its superintendence in the hands of the provincial legislature: it ordained that the council of the college should be elected, half by the Legislative Council and half by the House of Assembly, and that there should be a new election every four years: and by these provisions it would have necessarily rendered the college an arena of political warfare, and liable to be changed or subverted at every new session of the legislature. Besides this, *it totally excluded Christianity from the university.* This bill, as we have said, was sent up to the upper house of legislature, and by them (to their honour) *unanimously rejected.* It was sent up a second time, and a second time experienced the same fate.

Matters remained in this condition when Sir Francis Head came into the country. "With that ardent spirit" (to use the words of the Bishop of Toronto) "and that intuitive apprehension of whatever is good and noble, which characterised him, he saw the vast advantage of establishing the university." Under his auspices the business was again brought before the legislature; and, in 1837, a bill was agreed to by the House of Assembly, which was sent up to the Legislative Council for their sanction. We have a very able Report from a select committee of that body, in which we again fancy we can recognise the hand of the Chief Justice. This Report discussed the question of the exclusiveness of the university, and showed that the confinement of the management of the institution to some one religious body formed the principle not only of all the old universities of Great Britain and Ireland, but also of two at least of the greatest reputation in the United States, as well as of the more recent ones in the lower portion of British America. It expressed the concurrence of the Committee in those parts of the bill which accorded with the suggestions of the College Council in 1827, *excepting* that portion which removes all distinct religious cha-



rafter from the college council, and all religious tests and qualifications from degrees in divinity. That this report expressed the feeling of the whole legislative council there can be little doubt: for although they afterwards yielded their assent to the exclusion of every other religious test for the members of the council, beyond the declaration of belief in the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures and of the doctrine of the Trinity; and likewise to the exclusion of all religious tests and qualifications for degrees of every kind, (including, of course, divinity), yet the memorial which accompanied the announcement of their assent to the bill, evidently shows that it was an unwilling assent. This document is likewise curious and remarkable, from its expressing the firm conviction that all interference of the legislature with the charter, without the *express* authority of the crown, was entirely illegal; and from its hinting, not obscurely, that such an act on the part of the advisers of the Sovereign, as that of permitting the legislature to remodel it, was entirely unadvisable. These passages were, no doubt, inserted with the view of showing to the ministers of the Crown, that if they should be disposed to take the ground that the language of their despatches had been interpreted too liberally, and, consequently, instead of giving the royal assent to the bill, to construct a new charter, there was, at all events, one branch of the colonial legislature whom they would not thereby displease.

The bill, however, became law, and steps were immediately taken for putting the university into efficient operation. A meeting of the college council was called, and the president, Archdeacon Strachan, at their request, drew up a report of the requisites for the opening of the institution. According to this plan he was to have proceeded to England, to select suitable persons as professors, and to purchase books and apparatus: the contracts for the building were even ready to be signed; when the rebellion of 1837 broke out, and again suspended every thing connected with the university.

On the restoration of tranquillity, during the administration of Sir George Arthur, the college council resumed their operations, and the legislature, on its part, again took up the subject of the university. A committee of both houses was appointed, and the result was an act whereby it was expected that the university might be brought into immediate operation, but on a less extensive scale than was originally contemplated. A plan for carrying this into effect was suggested and all but adopted, by which the business of the institution would have been commenced on the grounds of Upper Canada College, and by means, in part, of the buildings of the college. It having, however, been strongly objected to by persons whose opinion was supposed to be valuable, the plan remained in abeyance. The probability of the union of the provinces, and the consequent disuse of the legislative buildings at Toronto, which appeared admirably

sued for the *temporary* opening of the university, caused the further postponement and ultimate abandonment of the design. Meanwhile, statutes were from time to time passed, which would facilitate the working of the institution whenever it might be brought into operation; the president became, as first Bishop of Toronto, a person of still greater weight in the colony; and there can be no doubt that, but for the operation of political causes, something decisive might have been effected.

But if little was done for the university of Toronto in this interval, a great deal (in appearance, at least,) was accomplished for its adversaries. The Presbyterian body not having succeeded in persuading the council of King's College of the desirableness of appointing a professor of divinity of their communion in King's College,—and wearied out, as they professed, by the repeated delays in bringing it into operation,—determined to try what might be done to obtain a university of their own. Having succeeded in obtaining extensive promises of pecuniary support and endowments in land, they carried through the legislature a bill for establishing a college at Kingston, under the name of Queen's College, with the powers and privileges of a university. When, however, the bill was sent home for the royal assent, it was disallowed, as an interference with the prerogative: but, instead thereof, a charter was sent out, carrying its provisions into effect; and it was hoped that this party, having now an institution of their own, and exclusively under their own control, would rest satisfied, and cease from their aggressions upon King's College. It was, probably, with some such view that some Churchmen contributed towards its endowment. We have not an intimate acquaintance with its concerns; but we are informed, that, although there is a respectable boy's school in connexion with it, the collegiate department does not appear to have answered the expectations of its projectors. But this is anticipating.

The Presbyterians were not the only body who made trial both of the facility of a Whig administration and of their own ability in constructing a university. There had for some time existed at Cobourg,—a little town between Toronto and Kingston,—a school in connexion with the Wesleyan community; established, no doubt, from the very proper feeling that that education must be defective, if not positively pernicious, which does not train up youth in religious principles, and that it is our duty to instruct our children in such principles as we ourselves believe,—but bearing the title of Upper Canada Academy, in order to offer no obstacle to those *liberal* persons of the Church or of other denominations who might be willing to entrust their children to their care. Encouraged by the success of the Presbyterians, they likewise applied for and obtained a charter, erecting the school into a university, by the title of Victoria College. If, however, we may judge by the printed prospectus of its

second public examination, which has just come to our knowledge, it will be a long time before it produces any pupils on whom it will be even prudent to confer any degrees. The very limited range of subjects for examination shows that there are hundreds of private boys' schools in England far beyond Victoria College in attainment: and, indeed, the knowledge of Latin and Greek exhibited by the conductor, in the headings of two of the subjects of recitation, suggests the idea that they were first written in English, and then the first word the dictionary by chance turned up taken to represent their force in the ancient tongues. But this is a digression.

These two institutions, then, were set on foot during the dormancy of King's College; and although their pretensions to the character of universities appeared in the highest degree absurd, and every sober-minded man must have regretted that this venerable name, and the dignity of a royal charter, should be so degraded,—yet many hoped that when the little great men who originated them had each an arena of his own in which to expatiate, and (what is better) a useful occupation in which to employ and exhaust his thoughts and faculties, they would quietly attend to their own business, and leave the university of Toronto to itself.

Matters were in this condition at the arrival of Sir Charles Bagot in 1842. Being himself an elegant scholar and a member of the university of Oxford, he took the warmest interest in an institution which (as he fondly hoped) was to tread in the footsteps of honour and usefulness of the time-proved universities of the mother country. The first distinguished step in his administration was to come to Toronto, and to lay the foundation-stone of the college on the site so long destined for it. All accounts agree that this was the most brilliant day ever seen by any town in Upper Canada.\* The troops, the societies of St. George, St. Patrick, and St. Andrew, the Masonic society, the masters and scholars of the district grammar-school and of Upper Canada College, the clergy and gentry from all parts of the upper province, with the council and visitors of King's College (the first men in the province both in station and in talents), walked in procession before and behind the Governor-General, who was supported on the right by the Bishop, and on the left by the Chief Justice. Latin and English speeches and replies, public prayers and sermons, public dinners, Greek and Latin odes, gave all the characters, religious, scholastic, and festive which befitted the occasion. The presence of the Bishop and Clergy in their robes, the use of the ancient bidding prayer of the universities, the attendance of verger and bedels, the clause in the inscription on the plate placed under

\* We take our account of the proceedings from the publication at the head of this article, which appears to be got up by the Toronto bookseller in a style which would do no discredit to a London publisher.

the stone—"Præstantissimum ad exemplar Britannicarum Universitatum;"—all appeared to stamp the institution as one destined to be the support and stay of the Church in Canada. But there were by-standers, who eyed the ecclesiastical character of the proceedings with aversion and dismay; and there were others more friendly, who returned home sick at heart, feeling from what they knew of the under-current of opinion, that all the joy and enthusiasm of the day was but to be the forerunner of heart-burnings and discord, to burst out more fiercely than ever, when the feelings generated by the festivity of the occasion were passed away.

The new Governor, however, watched over the institution, interested himself to obtain professors from England, transferred the principal of Upper Canada College to the administration of King's College, under the title of vice-president, and pushed forward the erection of a building for the reception of students on the university grounds; and, had it not been for his lamented illness, would no doubt have brought it into play early in 1843; but he had barely time to sign the warrants for the appointment of the first professors, when he died, and left the university to his successor, with difficulties which (had he been spared) his hand might easily have disentangled.

It is due to Sir Charles Metcalfe to say, that he appears to have entered with great patience into the nature of these difficulties, and to have been willing to take any personal trouble to remove them. It is due to him, likewise, to acknowledge that he readily authorised the steps which were necessary to the opening of the university in the buildings formerly occupied by the colonial legislature. But he did not enter into the subject with the zeal of his predecessor; he did not give the university his personal countenance and support. The opening day however came, in June, 1843; the proceedings on which occasion are duly chronicled in the publication which we have already mentioned; which has furnished us with much interesting matter, and contains much more, which we have not adverted to. There was then a gathering from various parts of the province; divine service was duly solemnized in the college chapel, according to the rites of the Church of England. Then followed the ceremonies of the hall: six and twenty students were publicly admitted; addresses were delivered by the President, Vice-President, Chief Justice, and another of the judges—of the first of which we have made great use. On the next day, followed inaugural lectures from the various professors. The days thus occupied were felt to be glad days by the inhabitants and visitors, who witnessed their young friends and relatives admitted to commence their university career,—by the members of the old universities, who saw again the academic garb fluttering about the streets, carrying their thoughts back to days long passed,—and by the youth themselves, who were the first of

their province admitted, without changing their native air, within the ranks of candidates for academic distinction. But the slight sentence in the President's address—"if the college be hereafter let alone"—was painfully amplified in the conclusion of that of the Chief Justice: and when he foreboded as possibly, and not improbably, to arise in future days within the university, from the future operation of that spirit which destroyed religious unity in its amended charter, "a state of things, which, if it had been proposed in the first instance, or could have been anticipated as the probable result, would have been desired by no one, but condemned by all,"—there were a few who sympathized in all the fear and misgiving he expressed, and felt that a cloud hung over the opening of King's College, which all the other bright shows of the occasion could not dissipate from before their eyes.

The College immediately went into operation. It had for its acting superintendent the Vice-President, Dr. M'Caul, who is also Professor of Classics, and with him three gentlemen from England, as Professors of Divinity, Mathematics, and Chemistry; the two former of whom, Dr. Beaven, and Mr. Potter, had been advantageously known in England. The number of students entered was greater than had been anticipated; chapel, lecture, and hall, were duly attended, amidst all the noise and turmoil of political agitation. First difficulties were surmounted; everything was gradually falling into order; and there can be no doubt that the institution would have rapidly risen into public favour, by the efficiency with which every department was filled, had it not been for the working of political causes, which, by threatening its very existence, prevented many persons from sending their sons to it.

Within a few months the cloud which had been gathering burst in a storm of portentous vehemence. First came tirades and personal abuse of the President and Professors, and wordy dissertations in the newspapers; then a memorial from the trustees of the Presbyterian College at Kingston; after that, systematic agitation by means of public meetings, under the auspices of dissenting teachers; and, at length, public rumour brought the intelligence that *the Attorney-General of Canada West* (the Hon. Robert Baldwin), *by the consent of the Governor-General*, had introduced into the provincial parliament a bill for annulling the charter of the university, for taking away its endowment, and for establishing on its ruins another institution, open, in the fullest sense, to all sects and parties, and restricted to none: a bill drawn with a total contempt of all equity and constitutional law, of all experience in similar institutions, of religious principle of the very barest kind, of the most ordinary workings of human nature, of the very nature and genius of a university. Will our readers believe us when we say, that one of its least faults was, that it reduced the Governor-General, as chancellor

of the university, to a mere puppet in the hands of the Executive Council, who again must be the creatures of the House of Assembly? that it proposed to place the working administration in the hands of a Babel of professors, who must, *necessarily*, be of all various churches and sects who might choose to claim a place in it? that it placed these again under the check of an "Extra-mural Board," composed of clerical representatives from these various churches and sects, and of from a dozen to twenty *laymen*, who must, *necessarily*, owe their place in it to purely political party causes? that it did not *exclude* doctrinal religious instruction (which if it had done, it might have had the excuse of having done it for peace' sake), but actually *authorised* the teaching of *all* the rival religious bodies in Upper Canada, and their erection of theological colleges on the grounds of the University? and all this on the ground of equity and harmony! Can the fanaticism of infidelity go further?

But the circumstance which we most regret to remark is, that this bill (as we are credibly informed) was introduced with the full knowledge of the Governor, the Chancellor of the University, without ascertaining the pleasure of the Sovereign as to so violent an inroad on the prerogative, and without any communication with the council of the college, which, on every account, he was bound to aid and protect. We are tempted to ask—Can this be the same Sir Charles Metcalfe, of whom we have more recently heard so honourably, as standing up for the prerogative of his Sovereign against the very men who concocted this atrocious bill? We would fain hope that the immense accumulation of business, consequent on the long illness of his predecessor, prevented him from taking that full interest in the subject which was necessary for comprehending its importance; and much allowance must doubtless be made for the circumstance that he has not, at any previous period of his life, been brought into such a connexion with an English university, as to have attained any adequate knowledge of its nature, or to be aware of the proper relation of its chancellor to it. But, with every allowance that can be made, we still cannot comprehend how, upon the most ordinary principles of justice and courtesy, such an attack should have been permitted on a public body, with which the Governor was, of course, in constant official intercourse, without any notice to that body of what was intended. Still less can we understand how the deputy of the Sovereign, under a Conservative administration, could permit one of his council of advice to bring in a bill to destroy a royal charter, and usurp one of the peculiar functions of the Sovereign, as the fountain of honour; viz. the conferring on a new body the power of granting academical degrees,—without that direct and explicit authority from the Sovereign, which even under a Whig administration was thought indispensable.

Be this as it may, the council no sooner became aware of



what was intended, than they vigorously resolved to stand on the defensive, and not to surrender their trust without a struggle. They took the proper and dignified course of praying to be heard at the bar of the House of Assembly, against the bill. They employed (in addition to their own Professor of Law, Mr. Blake, and the Hon. Henry Sherwood, formerly Solicitor-General) the first pleaders in the province, the Hon. W. H. Draper, formerly Attorney-General and now one of the Executive Council, but then a member of the opposition in the Legislative Council. In addition to this, the Bishop of Toronto, as President of the College, presented a most vigorous remonstrance to the House, in the shape of a memorial. We have heard that the effect of one passage in his Lordship's memorial, in which he pointed out the vast quantity of land possessed by the Roman Catholic seminaries in the lower province, and stated that with equal justice the whole of these possessions might be confiscated and applied to the endowment of colleges open to all denominations—was like the explosion of a shell.\* The members from

---

\* The following is the passage referred to :—"The University of King's College holds its property by direct grant from the Crown, and its title to the same is equally, if not more clear than that by which the religious and collegiate institutions of Lower Canada in general hold theirs, though very inferior in value and extent ; but if it is to be confiscated without reason, and applied at the will of the Legislature, it is only the commencement of an evil that all good men must deplore. There may be a majority found (though I do not believe it) willing to confiscate the endowment of the University of King's College; but in a very short time, should so wicked a thing be consummated, another majority will be found, fortified by so unprincipled a precedent, to confiscate the like endowments in Lower Canada; for it is not to be supposed that when confiscation once commences, it will be permitted to stop, more especially since the temptation will be much greater. The endowment of the University of King's College amounts only to 225,000 acres, whereas the property belonging to the collegiate and religious institutions of Lower Canada exceeds 2,000,000 of acres, as appears from the following table:—

The Ursuline Convent of Quebec . . . . .	164,616 acres
The Ursulines of Three Rivers . . . . .	38,909 "
Récolets . . . . .	945 "
Bishop and Seminary of Quebec . . . . .	693,324 "
Jesuits . . . . .	891,845 "
St. Sulpicians, Montreal . . . . .	250,191 "
General Hospital, Quebec . . . . .	28,497 "
Do. do. Montreal . . . . .	404 "
Hotel Dieu, Quebec . . . . .	14,112 "
Sœurs Grises . . . . .	42,336 "
	<hr/>
	2,125,179 "

"Your memorialist deprecates touching one single acre of these endowments: they are all dedicated to sacred purposes, and should be held sacred. What he contends for is, that the endowment of the University of King's College is equally sacred, and that, if it be taken away (which God forbid!) the time will come, sooner or later, when so destructive a precedent will be applied to their confiscation. Your memorialist therefore prays that the endowment of the University of King's College may remain as it is, undisturbed; and he feels assured that no one who honestly wishes to preserve the endowments in Lower Canada, can, with any consistency, vote for its confiscation."

the lower province felt that the question, which they fancied was purely Upper Canadian, was coming home to themselves in a manner they little expected and saw not how to evade; and a sense of justice to themselves began to open their eyes to a perception of what was due to others. But whatever may have been the effect of the Bishop's Address, one thing is certain, that when, on a subsequent day, Mr. Draper came forward, and in a speech of high ability, indicative of a thorough acquaintance with his subject, and full of strong, clear, conclusive reasoning on the soundest principles of constitutional law, and of appeals to the sense of natural justice, demonstrated the utter illegality, injustice, and folly of the measure they were contemplating, he was heard for two hours with the most earnest attention. Indeed, we have been informed that so striking a scene—so noble an effort of forensic eloquence, had never before been witnessed in the province, and that by those who were present it will not easily be forgotten.

Before the Professor of Law and Mr. Sherwood could bring up their forces, the ministry had resigned, on the professed grounds with which the public is already familiar: but those who undertake to explain the hidden springs and motives of political doings tell us that the real ultimate cause of the break-up was this University Bill, and the utter impossibility of bringing the Lower Canadians to vote for it, after all they had heard.

Thus, then, has the university escaped another threatened danger.

Meanwhile, amidst the pelting of this storm, the university is calmly and steadily moving on in its course of usefulness. Taking the time-proved systems of the British universities as its model, it has incorporated from each (as the peculiarities of its charter and statutes permitted) whatever seemed advantageous and applicable to the circumstances of the colony: and the result has been the formation of a system, which, although as yet but imperfectly developed, is even already in efficient and successful operation, despite the open and covert attempts which have been and still are industriously made to produce internal confusion and strife; and holds out the fairest promise that the university of King's College, if it continues to be conducted upon sound principles, will prove both an honour and a blessing to the colony. The buildings in which the business is at present conducted, although unfortunately incapable of affording sufficient accommodation for the residence of the students, (an evil which is even now prospectively remedied by the erection of a building on the university grounds, which it is intended to render available for a system of domestic discipline), yet supply a commodious chapel, a spacious hall, a good library, and tolerable lecture-rooms. Divine service is performed in the chapel on week days at nine and five o'clock,—on Sundays at eleven and five, and is regularly attended by those students who are members of the

united Church of England and Ireland. The chief features in the arrangement of the collegiate chapels in this country have been carefully preserved; but some modifications have been introduced, rendered necessary by the circumstance that it was the university church as well as the college chapel. The chaste and sombre character of its fittings, and the simple propriety of all its arrangements (made under the direction of the Vice-President), appear, from the accounts which we have received, to have excited the admiration of every one who has visited it. Although an organ has not yet been provided, some of the students have been formed into a choir, under the direction of the Rev. Dr. Beaven, who has hitherto acted as chaplain, and have evinced not merely much interest, but very creditable proficiency, in the singing of Church music.

After morning service on week-days, attendance on lectures begins. The period occupied in those which it is incumbent on all the students to attend, is about three hours daily, on five days of the week. In the afternoon those lectures are delivered on which attendance is optional. The lectures in the School of Medicine, none of which at present are continued beyond Easter, are conveniently arranged from ten to five. We subjoin a scheme of the lectures for Hilary Term, extracted from the *Toronto Patriot* :—

I.—FACULTY OF ARTS.							II.—FACULTY OF MEDICINE.						
	M	T	W	T	F	S		M	T	W	T	F	S
Rev. J. McCaul, LL.D.							H. SULLIVAN, M.R.C.S.L.						
Classics .....	10 10	11 11	2	10 10	11 11	2	Practical Anatomy .....	10	10	10	10	10	
Rhetoric .....			10				W. C. GWYNNE, M.B.						
Logic .....			11				Anatomy and Physiology .....	11	11	11	11	11	
Rev. J. BEAVEN, D.D.							H. H. CROFT, Esq.						
Divinity .....	10	10	11 12½		10 12½		Chemistry .....	12	12	12	12	12	
Metaphysics and Moral Philosophy .....	10			10			Hospital Attendance and Clinical Lectures .....	1	1	1	1	1	1
RICHARD POTTER, M.A.							J. KING, M.D.						
Dynamics and Hydrostatics .....	12	12		12			Theory and Practice of Medicine .....	2	2	2	2	2	
Differential and Integral Calculus .....	12	12		12 10			W. BEAUMONT, M.R.C.S.L.						
Algebra .....	11 11			11 11			Principles and Practice of Surgery .....	3	3	3	3	3	
H. H. CROFT, Esq.							G. HERRICK, M.D.						
Chemistry .....	12 12	12	12	12 12			Midwifery and Diseases of Women and Children .....	4		4		4	
Heat and Electricity .....	3			3			W. B. NICOL, Esq.						
							Materia Medica, Pharmacy, and Botany .....	4		4			2

To every course of lectures strangers are admissible, at the option of the professor, under the name of occasional students.

We have already mentioned, that under the temporary arrangements it has been found impracticable to provide suitable apartments for the students in the buildings at present occupied by the university. As a commencement, however, of the system, they are at present required to attend dinner in the hall, which is served daily, immediately after evening prayers.

At the end of each Term a college examination takes place in the subjects of lecture during that Term; and at the close of each year of the undergraduate course, a more formal and strict examination is held on the subjects of the year, as a qualification for the degree. Those of our readers who are acquainted with the systems adopted in the university of Dublin and that of Durham, (the only British universities resembling Oxford and Cambridge, and yet consisting, like that of Toronto, of only one college) will perceive that the latter has derived regulations from each of these.

The terminal dues payable by undergraduates are unusually low, being but 9% currency for every university charge, including dinner. It is scarcely necessary to say that it is only by means of her endowment that the university is enabled to offer the excellent education she affords, at a rate which renders its advantages almost universally accessible.

The Library is at present composed of collections, which are but as nuclei in the different departments, when compared with such as are found in the larger and older libraries of this country. The authors and editions have, however, been carefully chosen; and although the number of volumes does not exceed 3000, there are included most of the works which are most practically useful in prosecuting the study of the different subjects. A museum of natural history has also been commenced, and no inconsiderable number of specimens already collected. In the apparatus requisite for the illustration of natural philosophy, the University is particularly rich. The collection has been described to us as equal in practical value to any possessed by any even of our own Universities.

From the short sketch which we have given of the present system and resources of the establishment, it must, we conceive, be evident to any university man, that it is at present faithfully and ably discharging the important duties confided to it; and it must be abundantly plain that every step has been taken which ought to extend the success of such an Institution, and enlist in its favour the sympathy and co-operation of all the intelligence of the colony: but yet what is its position at the present moment?

Because its conductors have sufficient religious principle to introduce the performance of divine service, (and that too con-

formably with a clause in the charter which is still in force);—because they have had sufficient sense to perceive that they must select some one form of Christian worship, and sufficient propriety (to use the weakest term that can be applied) to adopt that form to which the sovereign, to whom they were indebted for the charter, adhered, which is likewise that of the majority of those in the colony who are likely to require a university education;—because they had sufficient spirit and firmness, when the colonial administration attempted by an unconstitutional, iniquitous, and impracticable scheme, for getting up an infidel university on the ruins of theirs, to resist the attempt, and dared to discharge their duty as trustees, by protesting against this outrage on justice;—because they have had sufficient ability and knowledge of their business to organize and carry on an extensive establishment in efficient operation:—they are daily vilified in the newspapers in the sectarian interest; agents are employed for meanly prying into, and grossly misrepresenting, the minutest details of their management; and all the vehement and virulent invective, which an anonymous writer can pour through the columns of a low and venal journal, is thrown upon them: and with no other object than to force into union with them, in the conduct of their university, those who had failed in advancing their own,—to prevent the hearty union of sound-hearted men in support of Sir Charles Metcalfe, and thus to facilitate the attempt of the members of his late administration to re-establish themselves in the power of doing wrong.

Another attack is therefore meditated against it in the ensuing session of the Provincial Parliament. And thus the institution, which should be the abode of learned, quiet, and undisturbed industry, is kept in a state of perpetual irritation: the minds of its conductors are not permitted any repose: they are compelled, whether they will or not, to be mixed up with political broils and dissensions: persons in the colony, who have sons to educate, inquire anxiously, but many are discouraged from sending them, from the fear that, before they have finished their education, the institution itself may be wholly subverted. We hear that the Professor of Mathematics, disgusted with the state of things, is coming home; and until matters assume a more stable aspect, we fear it will be difficult to prevail upon any person of high standing to go out to supply his place. But if the subject should be again ripped up, and a Bill affecting the University should be passed, (which, from the desire of seeing some settlement of the question, and from sheer impatience of its continual interruption of other business, we should not be surprised at,) we feel sure, from the spirit shown by the President and Council on a former occasion, that the business will be brought home. We therefore feel desirous of ventilating the matter a little,—of doing our best to put it in a proper light,—

being anxious to exert our influence, whatever it may be, in preventing a great question from being decided without a due consideration of its merits; and not being without a hope that our voice may be heard even in the colony itself. When, in the excitement of the Reform period, a strong effort was made to throw open the English universities to dissenters by the removal of all tests,—and even sixty names could be found in the colleges and halls of Cambridge to advocate this pernicious innovation,—we remember that we spoke out; and we feel it our duty to speak out now.

There are, we imagine, three principal points to be discussed in connexion with the question of the University of Toronto:—the principles upon which a university ought to be founded in that colony;—the question of the Royal Prerogative;—and the practical question, what ought to be done in the present emergency.

We shall not undertake to argue the point whether education ought to be based on religion. We are thankful that the affirmative is now all but universally acknowledged. Even so long ago as the foundation of the Gower-street College, its directors acknowledged the desirableness of it, and only abstained from practically carrying out the principle from the impossibility of bringing themselves, differing as they did in religious views, to agree upon any one definite plan. They consoled themselves with the reflection, that “domestic superintendence” would supply what they omitted. But whether that was likely to be true or not in their case, it certainly could not be true in Canada, where most of the students, as the university extends its benefits, must come up from the country,—and where, therefore, if the university provides no religious instruction for them, none will be provided during the time they spend there. We do not ask whether it can be right for a public institution to attract young men from all parts, and bring them within the temptations of a city, and provide nothing to counteract the influence of those temptations: we trust there is no Christian-minded man who can have a second opinion on the subject. Even in our medical schools the importance of superintendence and religious control is beginning to be strongly felt, and the enormous evils arising from them are beginning to be rectified. We desire particularly to draw the attention of our Canadian fellow-subjects to this point. We know that there are many religiously disposed men amongst all sections of them: and we ask them,—Can they deliberately contemplate sending their children from home for nearly three-fourths of the year, for three years successively, without any parental superintendence, without any christian instruction or obligation to attend Divine worship?—for this is the state of things to which the efforts of some in that colony are really tending.



To go to another point. Is there to be no place in a Christian country where the young are to be *systematically* instructed in Christian doctrines? We do not say—where those intended for holy orders shall be so taught; for we claim for every young person the right to have his mind prepared by careful instruction to withstand the religious and moral temptations which await him. We say, that no educator of a young man does his duty, if he does not so prepare him. This was so thoroughly felt in all the old universities, that in them *rudimental Christian instruction was reckoned a portion of the liberal arts*;—so that a person wishing for a degree in arts must necessarily have made some proficiency in Christian knowledge. And this has been long observed in Oxford, and more recently, we believe, in Cambridge. In both of these no student can pass his final examination for his degree, who has failed in (what is technically called) his divinity.

But who is to do this? Can the parent? He is mostly so engaged in the duties of his calling that he has not the necessary time: if he had the time, he has not the talent; his talents are engrossed in another way. And if he had both time and talent, his son is away from under his roof, and he thus has not the opportunity. Who then is to perform this duty? Clearly those who have taken the charge of his education. There is another reason why it should be undertaken by them, which will readily be understood by any experienced person; and that is, that none but a practical teacher can adequately ensure that the knowledge communicated shall be really received and digested.

There is something more in religious truth, besides its evidence and grounds. Religious truth is a positive thing. It is a system of doctrines, incorporated with each other; and if Christianity is to be taught, it must be taught by its doctrines. We are not now discussing *what* its doctrines are; but we assert that churches and sects concur in teaching that it is (or is founded on) a system of doctrines. There may be disputes as to what are essential doctrines, and what non-essential; but that there are some essential doctrines, all agree. How, then, are these doctrines to be inculcated?

Will you (the Founders of the University) endeavour to make a *collection of essential doctrines*? Who then shall decide what are essential and what not? What one authority can you set up, to which all shall defer, superior to all existing churches and sects? You know that there is no such authority. Will you call a council of representatives of all parties, and require them to agree to some one document? You are aware that something of this kind has been tried in Ireland, and that it has failed to produce unanimity or general satisfaction; in short, that by far the larger portion of the Clergy of the Established Church, and a considerable number of the Romanists as well as of the Presbyterian body, will have nothing to do with it.

We are fully aware that a voluntary society, or a body of trustees appointed to carry out a specific object, may, and can unite together upon some specified grounds, and agree that, *so far as they are concerned* as a body, such and such matters shall be *treated* as essential; but the question now is, for a *national* purpose, what *is* essential: and has any body of men, taken out of discordant churches and sects, yet positively agreed upon that point? Does any practical person think it possible to come to such an agreement?

Besides, how can you teach without a teacher? And what thoughtful man, what conscientious man, will you find, who will consent to be bound up to any joint stock system, and to say to his pupils practically, as he must do, if he consents to instruct them on such a system,—Up to this point is certain, undoubted truth; all beyond is uncertainty? An automaton might work such a system; but an honest man, a true Christian, cannot.

We will then turn our thoughts to another plan. Since we cannot find any means of teaching merely essential truths, what if we employ to instruct our youth teachers of the connexion or sect to which he himself belongs? What if we commit *secular* learning to those who profess it, and engage and support in our University, to inculcate *religious* truth, the teachers of the Church of England, the Establishment of Scotland, the Church of Rome, the Independent, the Baptist, the Quaker, the Wesleyan; in short, of all the sects and denominations to which our pupils may belong? Religious *truth*! did we say? Is all that these various teachers would inculcate *true*? Why, then, do they oppose each other? *Can truth be various and contradictory*? Can the man, for instance, who maintains an authorized ministry as of divine appointment, and the man who denounces any such appointment, be both right? And yet this is but one question out of a score or a hundred. In supporting, then, these contradictory teachers, we must of necessity in several points, and those very important ones, support truth,—nay, *divine* truth—on one hand, and *oppose* it on the other. Is this the part of Christians? Is it the part of sincere men? Can there be any beneficial result to the minds of youth from such a system? Shall we not practically teach them that there is no important difference between truth and error?—nay, that there is no certain error, and, consequently, no certain truth?

There is a third plan,—to have one dominant style of doctrine in the University; but, in addition to this, to authorize the introduction of instructors in the views of other bodies, if members of those bodies should require it for their children. This labours under the defect of its predecessor, although not in so high a degree. It was practically tried at the Dissenting Academy at Daventry, as may be seen in the *Quarterly Review*, (vol. xxxiv. p. 485); and the result was, that most of the pupils

held no definite form of doctrine, and many lapsed into unitarianism and deism.

We might mention a fourth scheme, if the business were about the instruction of mere children; viz. that a single instructor should teach the doctrinal views of all the various denominations to which the pupils belong, from their authorized documents. We need scarcely say, that such a plan is adopted only by second and third-rate masters of private schools; and that it must necessarily either *find* the instructor indifferent to points of faith, or *make* him so. We need not say that no person, having a character such as that which ought to belong to the professor of a University, could be found to carry out such a scheme.

We know of only one more method which can be suggested; viz. that the founders of the University should establish that form of doctrine and that mode of worship which approves itself to their own conscientious conviction, and teach and maintain that alone, alike under the same governing authority. We need not say that the last was the plan pursued by the founders of the Colleges and Halls of Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin. It is that which was intended to be adopted in the original charter of the Toronto College. It is one which it is *possible* (but not easy) to pursue under the amended charter, if the Crown so pleases, although the *principle* is grievously impaired by that amendment. It is the only principle worthy of either individual or body, professing to regard religion as a reality, and not a mere empty name.

But there is another question raised by this attempt to cancel the charter of King's College, and that is, the question of the *Royal Prerogative*. Upon that subject we have not to express an opinion altogether *de novo*; for when the pretended University in Gower-Street was first set up, we protested against its assumption of that title, as an invasion of the prerogative of the Crown. We referred to the opinion of Sir Edward Coke, that universities, *quâ* they were corporations, were "creatures of the Crown;" and we said—"The assumption, therefore, of this title for the Gower-Street College is as egregiously improper as it is presumptuous. Mr. O'Connell has just as much right to institute an order of knighthood, as this council to erect a University: the one is as much an assumption of sovereignty as the other."

This opinion is supported in a very able and cogent manner by Mr. Draper, in his speech, and we are sure would be sustained by all the best legal authorities in this country. These are Mr. D.'s words, as reported in the *Toronto Patriot*:—

"I think I can show that there is no exception to the rule I have laid down in the legislation of Great Britain—in other words, that

there is no University there which has been erected by Act of Parliament. The statutes passed in the 13th Elizabeth, were not charters erecting the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge; but confirming certain privileges and making good lost charters, deeds, and grants. Trinity College, Dublin, has its charter from Queen Elizabeth. A papal bull instituted St. Andrew's in 1413, and in 1432 James I. (of Scotland) ratified its privileges. Glasgow was established by a papal bull in 1450, and a royal charter in 1453 confirmed its establishment. Aberdeen commenced with a papal bull in 1494—with a royal charter two years after. The College, now called King's College, was founded by Bishop Elphinstone, in 1505. Marischal College, in New Aberdeen, was founded under royal authority in 1593, ratified by an Act of the Scottish Parliament, and appears to have derived more from legislative authority than any I have named. Edinburgh was founded in 1582, by James the First of England (Sixth of Scotland); he also increased and confirmed its property and privileges, by successive charters in 1584 and 1612, and in 1621 an Act of the Scottish Parliament was passed, confirming various grants of property made to the town of Edinburgh, for its support, and among other things ratifies the previous grants and charters. The University of Durham owes its existence to a royal charter, dated the 1st June, 1837; and the London University, to two charters, one dated 28th November, 1837, and the other 5th December, 1837. All the English Universities have derived their charters direct from the Crown; and to that at Dublin, the same remark applies. Nothing has been granted by legislation, which it was the prerogative of the Crown to grant, and no alterations have taken place in any charter without the consent of the College itself. With respect to these Universities, therefore, my position will be found literally correct, and with regard to the Scotch, virtually so; though a discrepancy as to them would be unimportant, as they were not founded as ours were, under the operation of the English law. Even in our own experience, we have cases in point. The University of Queen's College, at Kingston, owes its foundation to a royal charter, the act of the Legislature erecting it having been disallowed; and Upper Canada Academy, now Victoria College, which is the strongest exception to the rule I have been able to find, owes its incorporation to a royal charter of the 12th October, 1836. In incorporating a totally new University, therefore, I think it may be asserted that the Colonial Legislature are assuming to do that which the Parliament of England never did—which the Parliament of Great Britain never did, and which the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland never did."

We therefore cannot but regard it as a great blot and stain upon the late Whig Administration, that they should have permitted any interference, by the Local Legislature, in an affair of that nature, other than by way of advice. We venture to affirm, that this is the first instance, since our constitution has been at all settled, in which the ministers of the Crown have authorized the interference of the Legislature in altering the constitution of a University, and we earnestly desire that it may

be the last. The great danger of tyranny now is from the popular branches of Legislatures; and we therefore trust that, *for the benefit of the subject*, every remaining portion of the prerogative may be guarded with the most jealous care. And this is still more important in a Colony, which, from its proximity to a neighbouring Republic, must always be in danger of being over-run with democratic principles, and which our best information assures us to be greatly overspread with them at this moment.

But not only is the creation of an University an act of sovereignty;—the interfering with a charter of any kind is an infringement both of the prerogative and of the rights of the subject. It is a principle of the constitution, (as Mr. Draper has well stated it,) that no power in the country has the slightest power *over* a charter, (supposing it not to be contrary to the established laws, or to the rights of individuals or bodies) excepting in the way of interpretation; and that rests (we imagine) with the Sovereign's courts of Law. And it is equally a principle that the Sovereign himself cannot recal a charter once granted, without the consent of those to whom it is granted. This, then, was another sin of the Whigs,—that they joined the authority of the Crown to that of one branch of the Provincial Legislature, to oppress a corporate body. It is no answer to say that this body gave its assent to certain alterations, and even suggested them. What is done under the pressure of two of the very highest authorities, and under the feeling that, in the existing state of things, might is sure to triumph over right,—is not to be regarded as a voluntary act. Moreover, it is to be observed that the Council of King's College never did *assent to all* the changes which have been made in their charter, they only did not refuse to act under it, after it was altered: they never did give their previous assent to the destruction of unity of religious sentiment in their own body, or to the exclusion of all religious qualifications from degrees in divinity, however they may have *submitted* to them. Nor should it remain unnoticed, that this council was, after all, but a temporary council, consisting (with one exception) of persons who were not intended to have the ultimate management of the affairs of the College. We have no wish to cast the slightest imputation upon the integrity of a single individual of those who at that time composed that body; but it is evidently very possible for a government, determined on rescinding the charter, to have so organized the temporary council, as to ensure assent to their views.

We need scarcely repeat our earnest hope that no *Conservative* Administration will sanction so flagrant an act of tyranny as that of rescinding a charter, even though it have been tampered with by Act of Parliament; or weaken the Crown, by making it consent to its own degradation,—for degradation it must be for the Crown to permit any other branch of the Legislature to

usurp powers which have been reserved to it, not for the exaltation of the individual who holds it, but for the benefit of the people at large.

Having disposed of these two questions, we come to the third, viz. the practical inquiry, what should be done in the present case with the University of Toronto.

The first question which arises is, Why should any thing be done? You have an Institution which you have not long since set into active operation; which you have furnished with Professors diligently and patiently engaged in their various occupations, although distracted in them by the constant dread of organic changes (a state of things which is even now sending one of them home again); and would it not be much wiser to allow the Institution to go on, and settle itself, and show its fruits, before you pronounce that *any* change is requisite? All the arrangements have been made (as was stated very clearly in the address of the Bishop of Toronto at the opening of the University) in the strictest agreement with the very letter of the charter; concession has been carried to such an extent, that no student is required to attend the College Chapel or the Divinity Lectures, the principles of whose parents furnish ground for a dispensation; which (as our readers must be well aware) is a step beyond what we should have thought right or advisable, in a University. What possible pretext can there be for interference, unless the corporation itself should discover that their charter is one which offers impediments to its practical working, or it should appear that any portion of the charter had been contravened by the acts of the Corporation? And, in the latter case (if we understand aright) that very document provides that the Queen may rescind the obnoxious procedure. Why, then, should you (the British Government) interfere? And if you do not interfere,—if you do not directly authorize the introduction of some measure on the subject, or give hopes that you will sanction such measures, nothing can be done.

What, then, can induce you to wish to interfere? You will tell us, perhaps, that you are urged by political necessity; that you are bound to govern the colony by means of its local legislature, upon the principle of endeavouring to satisfy the local Legislature; that this Legislature is in the highest degree dissatisfied with the university as at present constituted, and determined on obtaining a change in its constitution; that, in short, you doubt whether you shall be able to carry on the government at all, if you do not make some concession to popular feeling on the subject of the university. We confess that, if your apprehensions are well founded, this is a very grave state of things; that the public feeling of Canada is so depraved that a majority of its most prominent men are bent upon a twofold invasion of



the prerogative of the Crown and of the property of the subject; and that they will impede the working of the government; *i.e.* practically, that they will instigate a rebellion against your authority, if you will not indulge them. But, supposing you yield upon this point, and commit an act of tyranny, to gratify a predominant party, such as republican America was not guilty of, (for even she religiously respected the *royal* charters of her universities,) are you sure that it will conciliate them any the more to your sway? Will they not begin to discover that the power is not yours, but theirs? Will not this discovery encourage them to further aggression? Will any right or prerogative be safe? In short, will you not be compelled to allow them to govern themselves without control? and will not the representative of the Crown be a mere puppet?

But you have not always acted upon this plan of conceding right to might. You are now supporting your governor-general, in maintaining the royal prerogative, upon a point which is, in most respects, of much smaller importance than this. When you assumed this attitude of resistance, you were, no doubt, well aware that you were placing yourselves in opposition to a majority in both houses; and yet you have taken your stand, and, no doubt, intend to maintain your position, although you are perfectly aware that you cannot rely upon being supported in the next session of the provincial Legislature. But you trust in your good cause; in the consciousness that you are simply doing your duty; in the good feeling which you perceive to prevail amongst the most intelligent portions of the community; and (we hope) in the blessing of Heaven operating to your aid in modes which you may not foresee. At all events, you feel persuaded that if you do not make a firm stand now, the tenure of the Canadas, as a colony, is, in effect, given up. And why cannot you make the same stand on the university question? You would be then maintaining, not only the prerogative, but corporate rights—the rights of the subject. And you would be maintaining the position of the Church of the empire, of the Church of the sovereign who granted the charter.

We say all this on the supposition that there is a strong disposition throughout Canada to force the destruction of the university as a religious institution; but our best information leads us to the conclusion that this is far from being the case. The real parties who make all the stir upon the subject are the political adventurers, whom the governor-general has so fortunately been rid of, aided by a few agitating Presbyterians, Wesleyans, and Independents. The far larger portion of intelligent persons are either Churchmen, or persons who would much rather see education in the hands of Churchmen, than to have religion altogether excluded from it. There are, no doubt, large masses of persons, profoundly ignorant on all public questions,

but ready to be led away by grievance-mongers: but is the province to be governed at their pleasure? Ought not a government rather to keep steadily in view their diminution, by the gradual extension of instruction upon sound constitutional principles?

Again, even on the ground of policy, should not the Church of England be sustained, as always tending to loyalty and union? Is that equally certain of other bodies? Who are the religious bodies who are urging you to break in upon the charter of King's College? Is there a certainty that these bodies possess the political importance you are required to attribute to them? Is it certain that what they now possess will continue? Is it certain that, if they are not positively encouraged by the Government, as a political party, they will not be absorbed more and more into the Church of England? And is not such a consummation much to be desired, upon purely political grounds? The Presbyterians in Canada have hitherto claimed the support of the Government, as being attached to the established religious profession of Scotland; but is there not every symptom of a large portion of them passing over to the ranks of the Free Kirk? Nay, have they not generally espoused its cause in the recent visit of one of its deputies to Canada? and is not the position of the Free Kirk hostile to the civil power? Again: are not the Wesleyans liable to constant division? Are not a large portion of those in Canada at this very moment absorbed into a new sect, the Millerites? How long, then, are they likely to remain a political party of any importance? The Independents, again, are chiefly notorious for their republican tendencies: are they to be fostered? Is not every one of these bodies numerically inferior to the Church? and is not the latter gaining ground upon them daily?

But you say that, although these may divide *ad infinitum* amongst themselves, they will still remain united against the predominance of the Church; and in that way will embarrass the Government, unless conciliated by concession. We beg, then, to suggest whether there is not this probability, that the better and more orderly will be more and more absorbed into the Church, as sound education extends its influence, and the more violent become more democratical and requiring. Is the case of the English Dissenters no lesson? Did not their claims rise with every concession, until even the ministry most favourable to them was compelled to decline going any further? Have you never heard a whisper, that if the power of the Government is seen to be constantly used to the detriment of the Church in the colony, Churchmen will begin to feel indifferent to British connexion, and will not care to stand up for it; and, therefore, that when the projects of the democratical party have fully succeeded, and you have resigned all power into the hands of

demagogues, and *they* push aside the phantom of a throne upon which they have climbed to power, Churchmen will not feel disposed, as they hitherto have done, to stand by it and support it? We confess that we have heard such a whisper, not from the noisy and violent, who are only angry when their party is out of power, and have no more real respect for authority than their opponents, but from the cool, the calm, the reflecting; from those who dread the results of another revolution, but are perfectly persuaded that it must inevitably come, if the passions of the ignorant and unstable are to become the rule of government; from those who think the connexion with England valuable, so long as that connexion promotes in the colonies the principles and feelings which characterise the mother country, but who would not, and *could not* value it, if the influence of the Crown were prostituted to the discouragement and destruction of those principles and feelings. May our colonial rulers pause before they alienate these hearts! may they have the wisdom to see where the real bonds of British connexion lie, and to cherish in the colonies those high and glorious institutions which have fashioned the character of our own country!

We desire not to be mistaken. We abhor all intolerance, all persecution. We would concede to every thing that can be deemed conscientious, the freest liberty of action, unless it interferes with the public peace, with private or corporate rights. We detest ecclesiastical agitation and intrigue; and we detest it, not only in Churchmen, who seldom practise it, but in dissenters likewise. We would violate no rights, we would infringe no liberties of dissenters, but we would maintain and defend the rights of Churchmen. We would cherish and extend the influence of the Church in all parts of the empire, by allowing our countrymen to see her as she is, and judge for themselves. We would not pamper her, for that would be her ruin; but we would labour with a careful, diligent, watchful hand, to extend her moral and spiritual influence in every part of the dominions of our sovereign. Our government would then appear a Christian government; our fellow-subjects everywhere would respect its earnestness and sincerity far more than they do its recent indifference. They would see a dignity in principle which they will never discern in shifting expediency. Such a line of conduct would not exasperate even those who were opposed to it; for calm and tolerant earnestness never exasperates: on the contrary, our spirit might extend to them; they might learn to sustain their views with less of faction and more of peaceful sincerity. Thus truth would be more sought after; and the real, earnest, careful search for truth must tend more and more to its attainment: and in it to a unity deep, heartfelt, and lasting.

But whilst we think that nothing should be done by the

government at the present time, beyond the indication of their determination not to countenance any further tampering, by additional legislature, with a royal charter, we cannot, on looking at that charter, as at present amended, consider it as a document by which any university can be *permanently* conducted.

In the first place, we object to the constitution of its council. What can be more anomalous, or absurd, in a body composed of *ten* members, besides the chancellor and president, than to appoint that four of them should be the speakers of the two Houses of Assembly, and the attorney and solicitor general? To say nothing of the known fact, that these persons always owe their elevation to political causes, ever since the removal of the legislature from Toronto, it has scarcely been possible for them to attend the meetings of the council; and the result, of course, must be, that the whole business has to be done by the seven resident members, of whom five are absolutely necessary to form a quorum. We cannot, therefore, but conclude, that it would be wise to make a return to the original constitution of that body, by excluding these political councillors, and appointing to it a greater number of Professors; still retaining one feature of the amended charter, by which the Principal of Upper Canada College has a seat at the council. And whilst we are upon this point, it appears to us desirable that certain *departments* of the university should be represented by their respective professors, instead of the members rising to the council by seniority of appointment, as by the present charter; for, by this latter plan, it may easily happen, (and, in all probability, will happen, if things remain as they are,) that a majority of members of the council will pertain to one faculty, that of medicine; and that the important departments of divinity, law, classics, and mathematics, may have no representation whatever. Indeed, the present result is, that law and mathematics are excluded, and that medicine and chemistry have three representatives. Whether it may not be proper to give the members of the council priority in that body, in the order of their appointments to it, is quite another question. But, no doubt, those on the spot, if consulted, would be able to suggest the best constitution of that important body, and the best remedies for that obscurity and perplexity on several points which appear in the charter.

But the greatest objection to the council, as at present constituted, is the absence of religious unity. No one is required to be a member of the Church of England, except the president, or to be pledged to anything beyond the vague "Declaration of belief in the authenticity and inspiration of the Scriptures, and in the doctrine of the Trinity;" which, of course, may admit anything but a Socinian, if it can be certain of even

excluding him. Now, supposing that future chancellors should take the view that it is their duty to appoint persons of various religious belief to the council, to what state of attenuation may we expect the religious instruction of the University of Toronto will be reduced in the course of fifty years? What is likely to become of the college chapel, and the daily worship of God, in which we are informed that the students now join with a regularity and propriety which might be an example nearer home? We, therefore, can never look upon the institution with anything but misgiving, until religious unity is restored in the governing body. We regard it as an injury to the members of the Church of England that that unity was impaired; nay, more, we regard it as an injury to the whole people of the colony; because we are fully persuaded, that if the institution is worked according to the animus of those who procured the alterations in its charter, its direct tendency must be to promote infidelity (that is, indifference to all religious belief,) throughout the province; and a more pernicious infliction we cannot conceive.

But besides the objections to the *constitution* of the council, it appears to us that its functions are far too universal. Taking the charter literally, there is nothing of the minutest character which ought not to come under the supervision or direction of that body. Now, we do not deny that it may be proper, in the first instance, (as was done in the case of the University of Durham,) to appoint a body with universal powers; but then it ought to be with the understanding that this body should be empowered to constitute other dependent bodies to carry out such functions as cannot with convenience be reserved to itself. By persons of plain common sense, indeed, that might be supposed to be implied, of course; but we can see, by the newspapers in opposition to the University, that there are those who refuse to admit common sense as an interpreter of the charter; that there are those, in short, who deny that the council has any power to appoint a permanent board for the administration of discipline, or a vice-president to undertake those more minute administrative duties, which the other engagements of the president, as Bishop of the diocese, prevent him from undertaking. And that being the case, we wish that there were some specific authority for these purposes.

We observe that a convocation has been provided for by the charter, but we understand that no such body has ever met; nor are we much surprised, for the very constitution of that body is left to be provided by the statutes of the council; and, from all we hear of the constituent members of that body, we can see great difficulties in the way of its settling *any* constitution for a convocation. We therefore think that the constitution of the convocation, in all material points, ought to be

settled, either by the charter, or by royal statutes, sent out directly from home, and arranged by members of the older universities, upon a statement of the peculiarities of the case.\*

There is one more point about the amended charter which appears to require attention; we mean the direction that "no religious test or qualification shall be required for degrees in *any* faculty." What can have been the views of those who made such an enactment, we can hardly conceive. Can it be meant to imply that there is to be no qualification of a religious character for degrees in divinity? Could they ever have reflected that degrees in theology are an authority from those who confer them, to teach the science of theology? Can they have ever contemplated the case (which, as things now stand, is a possible one,) of a Presbyterian vice-chancellor, believing (as he must) that prelacy is a grievous error and corruption, being called upon to assist in empowering a churchman to teach that it is a divine ordinance? or believing that infant-baptism is most agreeable with the institution of Christ, to assist in commissioning an Anabaptist to teach that it is a delusion and a nullity? or believing that our Lord Jesus Christ is truly God, to give a degree in divinity to a Socinian, who he knows will teach that he is but a mere man? If that was the intention, we are at a loss to see how any conscientious man of *any* communion can work such a system. And that some such intention there was we fear, because, in the pet bill which the same party brought in last autumn, they especially selected this obnoxious feature, and explicitly ordained that the same Vice-chancellor should actually confer divinity degrees on the Churchman, the Romanist, the Presbyterian, the Wesleyan, &c. &c. We say, then, that an enactment which, literally interpreted, implies such a meaning, calls loudly for repeal.

Far otherwise did those feel who founded the ancient universities of the land. They knew that the Blessing of God was to be ensured only by making his truth paramount; nay, rather, they felt that religious truth *is* paramount to all other. With them it was first of all in its communication; it never ceased to be imparted through the whole course of education; and it crowned and surmounted the whole academical edifice, proclaiming to the world that the science of christian truth really is, what Aristotle declared political science to be, *ἡ κυριωτάτη καὶ ἀρχιτεκτονικὴ* of all sciences. We are most deeply indebted to them for that spirit, which, as Huber informs us, long made it difficult to sever the faculty of theology from that of arts; which, in short, thought a knowledge of his faith so essential to every

\* Experience, in the long run, will show to what quarter recourse must be had. We lately saw an application, made from one of the trustees of an American college, to parties in England, requesting an abstract of the Oxford statutes, and advice on such modifications as might fit them for the United States



Christian, that some instruction in it was a necessary element of a liberal education; and it became difficult to decide upon the precise position of the boundary between what is absolutely necessary to a liberal education, and what ought to be required from the divine. We are, we repeat, deeply indebted to them for the impress which that spirit has left upon the honoured universities of Great Britain and Ireland; we feel strongly that justice will never be done to our colonies, or to any portion of the empire, so long as there is a public institution for education connected with the crown which is not influenced by the same spirit.

What, then, do we propose with regard to this Canadian University? We propose that it should be left to pursue its career of usefulness, with the full assurance that no external power shall wrest from it its privileges. We trust that time will so calm men's minds, that some method may be found by which the present amended charter may, with the consent of the College Council, be exchanged for another upon better principles, and such as further experience may have dictated. Meanwhile, we would have the attention of the Chancellor of the University directed, in the appointments he makes, to the promotion of unity of feeling and action, especially in the College Council; being confident that, although such a course may raise occasional clamour, its wisdom would, in time, approve itself to all right-thinking persons. Thus may past errors be repaired, and that which, in its present state, and with the past conduct of the advisers of the crown, has been a source of dissension in the colony, and of weakness to the crown itself, may become a fountain of true religion and useful learning; may send forth a race of men attached to *all* the institutions of the Parent State, and thus ensure the permanent attachment of the Colony, by perpetuating amongst its sons the habits and feelings, and tone of mind, of their ancestral home.

---

*De Poeticæ Vi Medicâ. Prælectiones Academicæ Oxonii Habitæ, Annis 1832—1841. A JOANNE KEBLE, A.M. Poeticæ Publico Prælectore, Collegii Orielensis nuper Socio. Oxonii: J. H. Parker. 1844.*

THAT "opposites illustrate each other's nature," is an observation somewhere made by Plato; deeper than appears at first sight, and the importance and extensive application of which is not immediately obvious. Yet how large a portion of our knowledge is there, which is ascribable simply to the fact that we attain a positive notion of the object contemplated, beyond what it can itself supply us with, by viewing it in connexion with some second object, or counterpart, at once differing from and resembling it! "All things," it is written, "are double one

of another;" and this applies to the moral and intellectual world no less than to the natural. The great law of contrast, as it may be called, is, in fact, the prism which divides the rays of all knowledge, thus rendering them cognizable by our capacities, and revealing their nature by the aid of their developments. If in the visible world there prevailed one uniform colour, to the exclusion of the rest, our actual idea of colour would be doubtless so far inferior to what we now possess, that it is a question whether we should not be without any distinct apprehension of it whatever. So in morals, the philosopher examines the nature of the *unjust* and *involuntary*, in order to enlarge our positive conceptions of justice and free-will. Or, again, to take an instance in religious matters, such a disturbance of the general laws by which the world is governed, as was exhibited in the judgment of the deluge, was evidently calculated to throw a more extended light on the Divine character and attributes, than had been hitherto afforded to mankind. And, in like manner, when it is made a matter of surprise, as it sometimes has been, that Scripture-miracles and Scripture-prophecy, the two great evidences which so emphatically established the kingdom of God, should be paralleled and apparently therefore obscured in some degree, by similar antagonist systems in the kingdom of darkness, (heathen sorcery and false prophecy having been permitted to make head against the religion of the Law, and signs and lying wonders being the certain tokens of the Antichrist of the Gospel)—it should be remembered that these false systems may, on the other hand, be made instrumental, when employed rightly, even to the fuller understanding and appreciation of those very divine appointments which they counterfeit. We measure the pyramid by its shadow, and thus acquire a knowledge of its wonderful proportions, which would be otherwise unattainable.

Now of all subjects on which knowledge has been thus attained, one of the most interesting and striking examples is poetry. It is important to notice this, because there is a temptation to believe that, considering the confessed antiquity of poetry, it is impossible but that its nature must have been thoroughly scrutinized and sifted; and that, consequently, any pretensions to novelty in the treatment of it, will be either a departure from the known truth, for the sake of originality, or, at best, the reproduction of old sentiments under a new exterior. Such a suspicion may, accordingly, not unnaturally attach to any new work upon the subject, even to volumes by so eminent a writer as Mr. Keble, bearing as they do in their very title ("*On the Medical Efficacy of Poetry*") such promising indications of originality in thought and treatment. But if there be any truth in the principle, with the mention of which we began, then we should naturally expect that it is only in a late age of the world that we may hope to attain any full and adequate

notion of the essence of poetry; evidently because its successive phases and manifestations are calculated to throw fresh light on the amount of information which we possess respecting it; and to bring out, in consequence, into more prominent relief some feature hitherto unperceived or disregarded. Thus, as the field of observation becomes daily more extended, the received theories of poetry are found to be either erroneous or inadequate, and the way is gradually paved for that full and perfect definition, which is the comprehensive summary and embodiment of all the information on the subject that man can arrive at.

"Few have there been among critics," says Coleridge, "who have followed with the eye of the imagination the imperishable, yet ever wandering spirit of poetry through its various metempsychoses;" and Mr. Tennyson writes under the same feeling of the insufficiency of poetical criticism, when he exclaims—

"Vex not thou the poet's mind  
With thy shallow wit;  
Vex not thou the poet's mind,  
For thou canst not fathom it."

So much the more valuable then, because so rare, are the observations of a writer uniting in himself the qualifications, so seldom found in the same person, of being at once both a poet and a philosophic critic. That the present volumes have done a great deal towards the solution of the mystery still hanging about the whole question of poetry and poets, can scarcely be doubted by any one—by any one, at least, who ventures to trust the pleasure which he has received while reading them, as consequent on finding the principle therein advocated capable of solving so successfully the phenomena with which it has to deal—on feeling that a clue has been put into his hands which reduces to intelligible order the otherwise "*irremeabilis error*" of the poetical labyrinth.

To judge, however, how much Mr. Keble has actually contributed of what is new and valuable, would require an examination of the various theories of poetry which have been hitherto put forward, and most generally received. This, of course, we can only partially accomplish, by devoting our attention to one or two of the most important of them, those of Plato and Aristotle in particular, as far as they are discoverable in a general investigation. These two great masters have, however, furnished, we believe, the outline and elements of all succeeding systems; nor are these latter, after all, so numerous as might be supposed; the reason being, that the majority of critics have, for the most part, found the poetical character a problem too difficult for discussion, while the real lovers of poetry,

"Contented if they might enjoy  
The things which others understand,"

are too much engrossed with their study to care for the reasons, when they are satisfied with the fact.

The Aristotelian doctrine, of poetry as consisting in imitation, is one which has the first claims on our regard, as being one of the most famous and generally-received theories, though occasionally disputed. It is sufficient to add, that it occupies a prominent place in the well-known poetical Lectures of Dr. Copleston. The whole doctrine is best given in Aristotle's own language:—

“Poetry in general seems to have derived its origin from two causes, each of them natural. 1. To *imitate* is instinctive in man from his infancy. By this he is distinguished from other animals, that he is of all the most imitative, and through this instinct receives his earliest knowledge. 2. All men, likewise, naturally take pleasure in *seeing imitations*. This is evident from what we experience in viewing the works of imitative art; for in them we contemplate with pleasure, and with the more pleasure the more exactly they are imitated, such objects as, if real, we could not see without pain, as the figures of the meanest and most disgusting animals, dead bodies, and the like. And the reason of this is, that to *learn* is a natural pleasure, not confined to philosophers, but common to all men.”

He then goes on to say, that imitation being thus natural to us,—“Those persons in whom originally these propensities (to imitation) were the strongest, were naturally led to rude and extemporaneous attempts, which, gradually improved, gave birth to poetry.”

Now the discussion which has been carried on for and against the doctrine contained in this passage\* might apparently have been simplified by the consideration, that the principle itself is of far more universal application than to the single question of poetry; for not only is the same principle common to the fine arts in general, (as Aristotle himself implies,) but it is, in fact, the “great spring of all the activity of our minds, and their chief feeder.” “Upon the accuracy,” says Mr. Wordsworth, “with which similitude in dissimilitude, and dissimilitude in similitude, are perceived,” [and this is exactly equivalent to Aristotle's “taking delight in imitations”] “depend our taste and our moral feelings;” and he proceeds to say, that it might be easily applied to explain even the pleasure afforded by metrical arrangement. The system of rhyme in modern verse, and of parallelisms in Hebrew poetry, occur to us as obvious exemplifications of the same principle. The same has been also still

---

\* Dr. Copleston mentions, in his *Prælections*, that it was warmly attacked by Scaliger, among others.

more fully expanded by Coleridge, in a passage\* at once so wise and so eloquent, that the quotation of it at length will be excused.

"One great principle is common to all the fine arts; a principle which probably is the condition of all consciousness, without which we should feel and examine only by discontinuous moments, and be plants or brute animals, instead of men;—I mean that ever-varying balance, or balancing, of images, notions, or feelings, conceived as in opposition to each other;—in short, the perception of identity and contrariety, the least degree of which constitutes likeness; the greatest, absolute difference. But the infinite gradations between these two form all the play, and all the interest of our intellectual and moral being, till it leads us to a feeling and an object more awful than it seems to me compatible with even the present subject to utter aloud, though I am most desirous to suggest it; for there alone are all things at once different and the same—there alone, as the principle of all things, does distinction exist unaided by division; there are will and reason, succession of time and unmoving eternity, infinite change, and ineffable rest."

We have dwelt at some length on the very extensive application of the principle of imitation, because it immediately affects the whole question of the truth of Aristotle's theory. For, the universality of the principle being admitted, the conclusion to which we are led is necessarily this—that *so far* as there is imitation in poetry, there must necessarily be pleasure attending on it, as in all other instances of the perception of similitude and dissimilitude; but it is altogether a further question how far this is a full and sufficient account of the pleasure which poetry produces. This may be made more clear by an illustration taken from the kindred art of painting. If we see a good specimen of the Dutch school, a fruit or a flower accurately painted, the pleasure which we receive is wholly accounted for by the mere fact of the perception of the similitude. But if we ascend higher in the art, and contemplate a fine Madonna from the pencil of Raphael, a person of cultivated taste will receive a higher pleasure than from the productions of the other school; and yet the mere excellence of imitation is by no means so prominent a feature as before. We exclaim, "How natural!" at the sight of a well-painted bunch of grapes, making the assertion that "this is that,"† by which Aristotle expresses the same feeling of recognition. But the exclamation would be out of place in the presence of a Raphael. It would rather be, "This is *not* that!" "How *super-natural*!" "How much transcending in its ideal beauty the ordinary forms that

\* Literary Remains, vol. ii. p. 44.

† "Ὅτι τούτ' ἔκωο.—*Poetics*.

we see around us!" It is owing to this delineation of a nature surpassing that of common humanity, that we derive such peculiar pleasure from the picture; and accordingly, the term *imitation* being inadequate to convey this, must be rather exchanged for that of *expression*, the latter word being more appropriate to indicate the imitation of an *idea*, as distinct from the copy of an external object. And as Aristotle himself virtually acknowledges that poetry is the representation of the ideal rather than the actual, the term *imitation*, as explained in his treatise, is felt to be insufficient. We must consider, however, that he seems to regard poetry as being necessarily engaged with human action,\* in some form or other, for its subject-matter, and consequently would naturally consider tragedy as the most perfect exhibition of poetry, which also seems to be the case. This being admitted, his employment of the term *imitation* is sufficiently intelligible.

The theory of Plato on the same subject, as far as it is discoverable, is interesting, both from its difference as compared with that of Aristotle, and because there appears, at first sight, some discrepancy between his earlier and later writings. In the famous passage in his "Republic," in which he insists on the necessity of excluding poets altogether from his perfect state, he grounds his objection to them on the same fact on which Aristotle also dwells, viz. that they are *imitators*. He is careful, however, to distinguish between *imitation* and *expression* (in the sense in which we have employed these words.) The poets, he says, are three degrees removed from true being. The first and highest form of being is the idea itself which the artist attempts to realize. It is, to use his own kind of familiar illustration, the ideal table present to the mind of the carpenter. Being in the second degree, is the realization or expression of this idea, *i.e.* the table itself which is manufactured. And, thirdly, there is the lowest degree of all, represented by the painted picture of the table; and it is to this last form of being that he applies exclusively the title of an imitation. To this it is that he compares the whole race of poets, treating them as mere imitators of the actual characters in the world, alike in their good and evil features indiscriminately; and it is on the ground of the mischief thus done by them to the morals of men that he insists on their exclusion. When a person sees, he says, Homer's heroes beating their breasts and tearing their hair about trifles, he will think himself at liberty to do the same. Now, judging from this passage only, we should conclude that Plato held poetry in very low estimation, not even admitting with Aristotle that it undertook in any way to express the ideal, but as merely imitative in the most restricted use of the word. Other

---

\* Ἐπεὶ μιμοῦνται οἱ μιμούμενοι πάντα.—*Poetics*.



passages, however, in his earlier works, express an opinion on the subject so different, as almost, at first sight, to amount to a contradiction. Thus, in his "Phædrus," he informs us that "there is a kind of frenzy sent by the muses, which possesses some exalted minds, and fulfils the office of instructing future generations, by leading such persons to glorify the numerous deeds of ancient heroes in odes and other poetical compositions;" and that "whoever approaches the portals of the muses, without this frenzy, hoping to become a poet solely by the aid of the rules of art, fails in his attempt, and his sober poetry at once disappears before that uttered by inspired frenzy." The two passages are, however, we think, not irreconcilable; though even M. Cousin inclines to the opinion that Plato altered his mind more lately, and that his second and matured thoughts on the subject are exhibited in the "Republic."

We think, then, that, while in the "Phædrus" he acknowledges most fully the *moral* efficacy of poetry, in the sense in which Mr. Keble so highly extols it in the "Christian Year,"

"God's own work to do on earth,  
(If the word be not too bold)  
Giving virtue a new birth,  
And a life that ne'er grows old,"

yet he fears that, in consequence of the natural carelessness of men, and its direct power to carry the mind along with it, the judgment of the hearer may not unfrequently be warped, and be led to approve any imperfect actions or characters that might chance to be introduced by the poet into the body of his work; and thus that poetry, though a mighty engine for good, might have its powers occasionally diverted to the service of evil. This view is further confirmed by a discussion carried on in his "Ion," with a rhapsodist, one accustomed to descant on the beauties of Homer before an audience. The rhapsodist, in the course of the argument, is compelled to admit that he is no competent judge or critic of many of the various subjects which Homer treats of; that the farrier can judge better of Homer's horses, and the smith of the armour of his heroes;—the simple fact of the case being this, that he is carried away by the contagion of Homer's inspiration, as by an invisible influence, and in turn communicates the same contagion to his audience—the effect produced, according to Plato's beautiful illustration, being like that of a number of rings, which, when touched by a magnet, remain suspended one by another in the air. It is clear, then, that Plato draws a marked distinction between the spirit of poetic frenzy (whatever meaning he may attach to it), and the particular external form or channel in which it reveals itself,—considering, evidently, that a thorough participation in the inspiring influence may co-exist with a complete ignorance of

the defects or imperfections, if there be any, of the medium by which it is conveyed, and may even make us blind to them altogether. In Plato's system we have, therefore, a new element over and above the simple principle of imitation put forth by Aristotle,—an element at once extending indefinitely the region of poetry, inasmuch as no one can say under what form or condition the so-called poetic frenzy may reveal itself. We do not mean that Aristotle has entirely overlooked the existence of this inspiration, which he and Plato designate by the name of "madness," but he seems to consider its sole utility and importance in poetry to consist in its being a sort of superior *dramatic faculty*, one enabling its possessor to represent all strong passions in the most vivid manner, and thus to effect the one great object of giving a complete representation of the various characters of life.

Of the two systems, then, we should say that Plato's, in relation to Aristotle's, was what the soul is to the body—Aristotle looking mainly to the outward form, Plato to the inward principle. And this brings us immediately to the consideration of the line which Mr. Keble has adopted. Aristotle seems to have given a direction to all inquiries in the region of poetry, which has never, widely at least, been departed from; all writers, generally speaking, having fixed their attention exclusively on the external product, the *work* actually exhibited to the world; and having framed their judgments and opinions, their canons of criticism, and the laws of poetical taste, accordingly. Mr. Keble, however, has abandoned this beaten track, and worked at the mine which Plato has indicated, rather than opened. The two volumes before us are the riches which he has dug from it.

After observing that there are very many and intricately connected sources of pleasure comprehended in the term "poetical," he tells us that his object is to distinguish some one particular pleasure among all these, to which the title of "poetical" may be more strictly and especially applied.

"In the first place, then," says Mr. Keble, "by a law of our nature, it is a great relief to us, when any emotion is more than ordinarily excited, or our imaginations especially engrossed, to be able to express our feelings by word, gesture, or in any other way whatever. Of which we have a most evident instance in the conduct of those persons who, when alone, talk and mutter to themselves if more than commonly excited. Hence, too, the practice, so usual among tragedians, of introducing their most important characters uttering a soliloquy about their own exploits or designs: this being a license permitted to the tragedians which, frequently abused by them as it was, would yet never have been tolerated at all were it not that the audience sympathized with it, as conscious that they were likely to do the same sort of thing themselves in a similar situation. The same thing is also

proved by those common outbreaks of tumultuous shouting or acclamation; nay, even by common swearing. The latter, though of course profane and impious, indicates, nevertheless, what an effect the giving utterance to words has in quieting the mind, and, as it were, opening a passage to relieve it."

"But it is only the savage and uncivilized who utter at random whatever happens to be uppermost in their thoughts, like brute animals, with uncouth exclamation and outcry. There abides, I doubt not, even in the most abandoned of men, something of a higher and nobler feeling, admonishing them, on many subjects, to be silent and uncommunicative; a feeling which, if they listen to, they will prefer even death itself to the explicit declaration of their innermost affections. \*\*\* Hence it happens, that those very persons who would be most benefited by confessing, and thus, as it were, relieving themselves of their burden of heart, are prevented from giving utterance to it at all; and this owing to a sense of shame, which is so far from being blameworthy that it is both ingenuous and natural. What, then, are such persons to do? They may not, and will not, speak aloud, yet they can have no rest of mind if they are silent; some are even said to have become insane in consequence.

"Not very different from these, though somewhat so, is the case of those persons who, like the youth in Virgil, 'are burning to attempt some deed of greatness;' that is, something vast, but uncertain and shadowy in its outline,—something not yet sufficiently made out in all its features and lineaments. This kind of feeling is known to all those who are at times absorbed in wonder when contemplating with deep attention the vicissitudes of humanity, or the admirable order of the material universe, or the most holy features of true and Divine Virtue. The mind, oppressed by the number and greatness of the objects all at once crowding upon it, and ignorant to which it shall first address itself, seeks for something which shall be to itself—what tears are to the body when in pain—a solace and relief. This same relief, I observed, was equally required by persons agitated with any uncontrollable *affection*; the only difference being this, that these last are prevented from speaking by a sense of shame, whilst the former are possessed by a feeling so *exalted* that it *disdains* to be clothed, even were it possible, in the language of ordinary life. Now it is in the gift of Poetry to man, that a most beneficent remedy for both the above-mentioned classes of persons has been provided, by the care of that prescient and merciful God who governs both heaven and earth and the hearts of men. I do not now particularly concern myself with the full force and meaning of this word—poetry; a minutely accurate definition of it not being now necessary. I only require two admissions to be made, which none will gainsay: first, that poetry has at any rate a certain close and intimate connexion with metrical numbers and regularity of sounds; secondly, that it is chiefly occupied in recalling, renewing, and bringing vividly before the eyes, the images of absent objects, partly eliciting and drawing forth from all quarters, and partly composing into regular order, all that is akin and similar to the subject in hand, however slender may be the link of their connexion; in a word, ministering to the imagination. Considered under

each of these heads, Poetry has a wonderful effect in producing relief and quietness of mind. Thus, when it lingers among words and numbers, it, as it were, furnishes the mind with new employment, and diverts it from its cares and anxieties. Again, when it ministers to the imagination, recalls the past, predicts the future, and invests every thing with the colouring which is agreeable to the mind itself,—then we feel that it indeed gives vent to, and relieves, the pent-up tide of feeling, and that we have obtained that solace from want of which Dido, according to the poet, suffered, namely,

———‘repose,  
And room for frenzy to exhaust itself.’

Again, how can the requirements of that modest reserve and commendable fear of the open light, of which we spoke, be better provided for, than by the circumstance, that a mind, whether passionately excited or elevated, attains its end by those circuitous paths and windings so well known to poets. And it is especially remarkable of the class of *elevated* minds, whose bent, however unconsciously, is to all that is sublime, how happy they have generally been in discovering an outlet for their thoughts to escape by, whilst they have been merely following the guidance of words and numbers, just as they happened to occur, leading them onwards, like the clue of a labyrinth.”—Pp. 9—12.

Such is the general account of Mr. Keble's theory, which we have preferred giving, as far as possible, in the way in which he has himself exhibited it, in spite even of the disadvantage attending on an inadequate translation of his elegant Latin. Its connexion with the statements of Plato \* we have already noticed. It is, in truth, the development and explanation of them; for what other account can, in fact, be given of the Platonic “frenzy,” than that it is the exclusive absorption of the whole mind by one ruling idea or passion? leading in some cases, as Mr. Keble has observed, even to actual madness; of which he elsewhere refers to Lucretius in ancient, and Shelley in modern times, as remarkable examples. He has, further, distinguished two kinds of inspiration,—that produced by exalted contemplations, and by intense feeling. On this division we have not space at present to observe more, than that it seems strongly confirmed by common opinion; all persons, on the one hand, agreeing in giving the name of poetry to the *wonderful*, in whatever shape, and sympathizing, on the other hand, with the outbursts of simple and vehement passion so common in the ballads and metrical legends of every country. The poetry, however, of deeper and softer feeling, being more obscurely manifested, is not so readily detected, or so cordially acknowledged.

We must notice, however, more particularly, that part of Mr. Keble's theory which is especially novel and original; we mean his view of the *indirectness* and *reserve* attending the

\* Mr. Keble himself quotes the passage from the “Phædrus,” in his lectures, and the motto of his work is taken from the “Ion.”

expression of poetic feeling. We will, therefore, give a few extracts illustrative of his views on this subject, though we can notice only very few of the examples with which he has so liberally enriched this portion of his lectures. Considering that a poetical spirit frequently exists where there has been no attempt at composition of any kind, he proceeds to examine cases of conduct and behaviour which would be generally admitted to indicate a poetical mind; and finds them all exhibiting the same feature—of an attempt to supply the absent object of the affections by links of remote association. Thus he refers to the boy, mentioned by Herodotus, who, going to the tyrant for his reward, and being told in mockery to help himself to the sunbeams, immediately, with his sword, drew a circle on the floor upon which the sun was shining, and, affecting to draw from it three handfuls of light, poured them into his bosom and departed.

"None would doubt," says Mr. Keble, "on seeing such a thing done in the present day, that this boy flashed forth some sparks of true poetic fire, whom yet we cannot suspect of having ever attempted a poetical composition. But it was characteristic of the poetic instinct to solace, by this kind of vain shadow, a spirit at once regal and ambitious, yet not ripe for immediate action. Had his adverse fates forbidden him to indulge any dreams of empire, one might fancy him soothing his disappointment, as best he might, by the aid of the Homeric poems, and singing songs of wars and battles, even to the day of his death."—P. 16.

It is similarly remarked by him, that the reason why rustics are generally more poetical than town's people, is, that the latter, from living constantly in the broad daylight of society, have lost that modest reserve which distinguishes the country poor, and accordingly give immediate and direct utterance to every emotion which possesses them. There is also a very interesting passage in which he speaks of the frequent employment of irony in poetry; irony, in its different forms, being so eminently characteristic of strong, and, at the same time, reserved feeling.

In his third prælection, Mr. Keble examines the various arts of painting, sculpture, music, architecture, and oratory, and shows, in detail, that, in each of these, the most poetical is that which evinces the working of a full mind. It is for this reason, he says, that sculpture (as is generally admitted,) is more poetical than painting. So, too, music is so eminently poetical, because it so indirectly, and yet so truly, expresses the windings of human feelings. So Gothic architecture is the most poetical of all styles, because the minds of its authors were so filled with the contemplation of the true God. So Bishop Taylor is more poetical than Burke, Raphael than Rubens, because in each of

these so much more is meant than meets the eye or the ear. From among these we will select Mr. Keble's observations on the subject of painting, as furnishing an admirable illustration of his theory.

"Call to mind, I pray you, that well-known dissight, which offends any but the most inexperienced eye, in Raphael's famous masterpiece of the Transfiguration. He has introduced two distinct subjects into one picture, having represented on the summit of the mountain the Son of God arrayed in light inaccessible, and about the foot of it, the band of disciples contending in vain, during the absence of their Master, with the evil spirit; having separated, moreover, the two subjects by so slight an interval, that the heads of the latter group are almost on a level with the top of the mountain itself. It would be difficult to persuade me that even a novice in the art, much less Raphael, could have fallen into this error from pure ignorance of the rules of art. But probably he reflected, that in proportion as the events proceeding in either part of the picture were brought into juxtaposition, so much the more full and truthful would his representation be of the secret force and character of the scenes in question. Thus he has exhibited, on the one hand, all images of tranquillity, blessedness, and religion, in the immediate presence of the Messiah, and, on the other hand, nothing but confusion and unrest where He is absent. It is Paradise contrasted with the dim daylight of this world. The painter, accordingly, was well content to appear somewhat neglectful of the rules of his art, in order thereby to convey a most grave lesson and ensample of piety, to be received throughout all ages. On the other hand, the Dutch painter (Rubens), being a most expert artist, is often said to have been too fond of exhibiting the powers of his pencil, displaying them eagerly and ambitiously even in the severest subjects. Take, for instance, the attitude of his Christ standing by Lazarus at his resuscitation from the dead.\* He has represented Him with His hands spread, the body slightly inclined forwards, the countenance expressing eagerness mixed with surprise, as that of a person contemplating an event which exceeded his expectations. Now this was just the attitude required by the whole arrangement of the picture, all the lines of which were found, by adopting this position, to converge into the most perfect harmony. Yet attention to this point has, if I mistake not, materially interfered with that expression of Divine Majesty, which we naturally expect to see exhibited on such an occasion."—Pp. 29, 30.

The illustration, which we have just quoted at length, is also useful in conveying a very good idea of an important feature in Mr. Keble's system,—his division of the class of poets into primary and secondary. The former are those who write from the inspiration of true feeling, and of course are, in Mr. Keble's view, the only persons really entitled to the name of poet. The latter kind are the whole crowd of imitators, who seeing

---

\* A picture in the possession of the King of Prussia.



the effect produced by true poetry, and possessing a natural facility for throwing themselves, as it were, for the time into any particular state of mind, are thus enabled to counterfeit the appearance of real passion so successfully, as to attain, especially if gifted with a command of language, a greater reputation than many who are true inheritors of the "divine faculty." Thus Dryden is, in Mr. Keble's estimation, the Rubens of his art, possessing wonderful expertness in the imitation of feeling and the judicious employment of language; but, like the rest of the class which he belongs to, characterized by a want of depth and reserve, and, more especially, of that *consistency* which always attaches to a writer engrossed by any sovereign and paramount affection of mind.

Mr. Keble, however, does not consider that the composition of a poet should necessarily exhibit throughout a perpetual flow of the enthusiasm which inspires him. Even in the most glowing poet, he says, there must be many passages introduced which do not produce any sensible poetical effect, "there being many minor pleasures in poetry, and the mind taking sufficient delight even in its own activity, or in the sweetness of the numbers, or the variety and beauty of the images which it awakens." And this, we consider, furnishes a full solution to the difficulty before referred to, that, namely, of reconciling the earlier statements of Plato with his later, his assertion of the powerful moral agency of poetry, with his conviction of the imperfections of much of the machinery which it employs. For it appears clearly from Mr. Keble's observations, that even in a truly inspired work of poetry, such as the *Iliad*, for instance, there may quite consistently be introduced a variety of characters, not exhibiting any ideal features, but simply imitations of those exhibited in ordinary life, these being necessary to constitute the frame-work of the composition—that *body*, of which the expression of feeling is the inner *spirit*. Mr. Keble has well shewn how the excellences of the Achilles of the *Iliad*,—that ideal character which is the full expression of the poet's mind, and invested accordingly with all attributes of superhuman glory and dignity,—are set off and contrasted by the delineation of a great variety of subordinate and more imperfect characters in the other heroes of the poem. It was consistent, therefore, in Plato to object to any imperfect models of conduct being introduced into his republic, without necessarily changing his opinion of the high office and mission really attaching to the poet. Who can deny that there is in *Byron* a certain fine and noble feeling, which is the secret inspiration of all that is poetical in his writings? And who can doubt, at the same time, but that his Laras and Childe Harolds would have been most rigorously excluded from the Platonic polity?

We regret that want of space must prevent our doing more

than a mere allusion to what would be a very interesting subject of examination,—the theories of poetry entertained by Coleridge and Mr. Wordsworth, in comparison with that of Mr. Keble. That there are points of difference between them cannot be denied, and, in some respects, the conclusions arrived at are strikingly at variance. Thus, for instance, Coleridge never was an admirer of Virgil; a poet on whom Mr. Keble comments with all the evident delight of a kindred mind. But still, even in Coleridge's system, as given us in his famous lectures on Shakespeare, and still more in Mr. Wordsworth's, as detailed by him in the preface to his poetical writings, there is enough agreement to justify Mr. Keble's observation, that "he believes his system will harmonize and contain in itself the central truth of the theories and opinions of the greatest writers on the subject, differing with each other, as they often do, most widely."

The fundamental difference between this and all other theories of poetry that we have met with, is contained in its assignment of the *final cause* of the poetic art; the old systems making it consist in "giving pleasure to others," the present system determining it to be "the affording of relief to the writer." And the interest of studying the old classic poets by the light of this principle, of following Mr. Keble in the application of it (the substance of the greater portion of his volumes) to the works of Homer, Æschylus, Pindar, Virgil, Lucretius, and others, produces a feeling of pleasure like that with which one follows the windings of an Alpine stream through a varied and magnificent country, each turn of it disclosing new and unexpected beauties, which are all the more admired because they have been hitherto unknown and unexplored. To some of the landscapes of this hitherto unvisited scenery we must now attempt to introduce our readers, concluding our comments on the theory itself with the remark, that the striking feature, and, in our eyes, distinguishing excellence of these volumes is, that they have done so much to remove that common misconception of the whole nature and character of poetry, which leads to the exclusive contemplation of the external body, rather than the spirit which it ought to enshrine,—the harmony of lines and colours, rather than the thoughts and emotions which they are intended to excite; the taste, in short, which forgets that the rule, "the law does not concern itself with minutiae," is as important in matters of art as in those of government; and which, confining its attention to points of slighter consequence, ends at last in that mere commenting upon words, and sentences, and "dramatic unities," which reminds us of the criticism of the shoemaker of old on the sandals of the statue of Phidias.

And, first, with regard to the general classification of his

poets: Mr. Keble, setting aside the usual division into epic, dramatic, and the like, as one based on accidental variations, adopts the simpler and more philosophical distinction of *persons* and *things*, that is, as fully as the nature of the subject will admit of so definite a line of demarcation. The perfection of tragic and of epic poetry, as far as the powers and inspiration of the writer are concerned, he considers to be identical; Homer might have been Shakespeare, and Shakespeare Homer. The province of either lies in delineating the actions and characters of men, and the difference in the external form of their compositions, is simply to be attributed to the taste of their respective periods. To this division belong, of course, Pindar and the Greek tragedians, Sophocles, however, being excluded from the ranks of the primary poets, as giving no perceptible indications of any native and original vein of feeling, but owing his reputation chiefly to the elaborate construction of his plot, and ingenuity in the general arrangement of the parts of his drama. The second head comprises the great school of the lovers of nature, the authors of pastorals and bucolics, the votaries of woods, mountains, rivers, and all the "changeable pageantry" of the external world, not sympathizing in the love of arms and the stir of society, which distinguishes the former class, but rather courting solitude and retirement,—a school later in its origin, and exhibiting more interesting features in its development. The great Latin writers, Lucretius and Virgil, stand at the head of it among the classics. Each of these classes, however, admits of a corresponding subdivision, agreeably to the original principles of the theory adopted. The world of society and active life was sufficient alike to furnish relief to the *affections* of a poet, like Homer, looking backward to the imagined excellencies of the heroic ages, and on the other hand equally so to the *contemplations* of an Æschylus, perplexed by the mysterious workings of Providence in the affairs of men. And what Homer is to Æschylus such is Virgil in relation to Lucretius.

"What if I shew," says the author, on this subject, "that the various species of composition are continuously united with each other, in a certain series and regular ordonnance. I confess that I feel scruples at finding myself in company with those who make a point of assigning some reason for everything. I am well aware of the fallaciousness of such a discussion: let it be my excuse, accordingly, in treating of this topic, that I am not so much debating as investigating. Is it not, then, the general condition of human life, that our first search after happiness is made either in the way of active occupation, or else in the study and pursuit of truth? that afterwards, fatigued and restless, we at length find harbourage in the tranquillity of rural scenery, and derive remarkable solace and satisfaction from a closer inspection of the features and lineaments of Nature. Why should we not sup-

pose that the poetry of the ancients developed itself in a manner somewhat similar? Thus the Homers and Pindars began by cherishing and handing down to posterity, with all due honour, the relics of that heroic life which had been severally transmitted to themselves. Next, Æschylus, the Pythagorean, taught the potency of a sublime philosophy. Finally, after either kind had been well and thoroughly tested by experience, a later age betook itself, in the last resort, as I before said, to the quiet haven of external nature and the charms of the country. And the partakers in this flight, as I may call it, would be on the one hand the Homeric and active spirits, now wearied with military or political life, and on the other hand, the Æschyleans, if I may venture to call them so, men who, tempest-tost amid numerous and violent philosophical altercations, might perhaps by this time have tired of their vague and troubled speculations, conducted, as such were, without any standard of adjustment or settled principle, on the fortunes and destinies of humanity. Of these two families, one is remarkably suited to Lucretius, the other to Virgil. The sum and substance of the poetry of Lucretius is contained in this one circumstance, that the writer gladly permits himself to be hurried away, and carried aloft to all that is sublime and distant, far removed from himself and his avocations. His words are,

‘Objects like these awaken in my soul  
A shuddering pleasure and a thrill divine,  
So mightily made manifest by thee  
Is venerable Nature all revealed.’

He does not merely rejoice in the disclosure of hidden secrets, or in the successful investigation of the subtle laws and principles of things—much less does he discover in the visible world any traces and shadows of the eternal and supreme Good. Would that it were so! but Lucretius meditates nothing of the kind. His object and desire is merely to provide, if possible, some remedy for an anxious and excited mind, by contemplating the magnitude and wonderful phenomena of the universe. He professes himself, indeed, a disciple of Epicurus, and declares a devoted obedience to his dictates. Nay, he even most assiduously inculcates that by no other medicine than his dogmas can the maladies of the soul, and the sorrows and troubles of human life, be alleviated. Yet you may notice that he is throughout disquieted and unsettled, as if conscious that he is standing on slippery and uncertain ground; afterwards he becomes cheered and recruited, when he begins to speak of the wonders of nature, the courses of the firmament, the sounds of forests and mountains, the flow of rivers, or of the ocean. From the manner in which he celebrates the praises of all these objects, we see plainly, that they are not employed merely as illustrations of his doctrines, but rather for the sake of the solace and shelter which they afford him.

“But of this hereafter: I have at present only said enough, in passing, to enable any one to judge whether the place which Æschylus occupied be, as I have stated, rightly and duly succeeded to by one contemplating earth and heaven with those eyes with which Lucretius, if we augur rightly, did actually regard them.

“Moreover, with respect to Virgil, none, I should think, can doubt

but that his verses are especially adapted to delight those persons who have at length withdrawn themselves from the world and public life, in consequence of having learned by experience how ineffectual is even the highest prosperity towards living well and happily. Observe how this sweetest of all poets is wont to temper his complaints, even of the more bitter sort, with an elegant and refined mournfulness, a habit common with those who have lived in the sphere of the senate and of political deliberations. He commiserates the lot of the 'sad and heart-sick race of men,' (as he himself styles them,) in the manner of one who would soothe a weeping child, wearing meantime a gentle smile on his own countenance. The summer flocks, the herds of cattle, even the swarms of the hive, and the brotherhood of trees, he employs and makes common cause with, seeming to content himself, not unwillingly, with this sort of pastime; as though, if he pushed his investigations below the surface of things, all would immediately vanish into smoke and ashes.

"I have said enough, accordingly, on the present occasion, to make it evident what position is to be assigned to the poetry of Virgil in accordance with the formula of which we are now treating; namely, that what Lucretius did for persons weary of philosophizing, the same Virgil did for those who were tired and disgusted with the bustle of public life; each pointed to woods and rivers as a place of refuge."—Pp.619—622.

The passage quoted is interesting, not only in that it assigns so satisfactorily to each of these great writers his own peculiar vein of inspiration, the very thread itself on which the pearls of his poetry are strung; but still more from its having elucidated the important fact, till now, as far as we are aware, altogether unnoticed, that there is a subtle connexion binding together into a system the manifestations of a spirit hitherto, apparently, the most utterly independent of the control of time and circumstance. The chains have finally been attached to the floating island. Poetry is proved to have been as fully directed by a superintending Providence, to have had its regular sequences, and run out its appointed harmonies, as much as history or philosophy, or the world itself,—a world, so clearly indicative of a Divine superintendence in all its parts, that men of clear intellects and irreligious minds, the Napoleons of the earth, have been driven into fatalism almost unavoidably, as the necessary creed of atheism. Mr. Keble, indeed, seems to consider that the *chief* and *proper* mission of poetry was finished at that fulness of time, when the Divine light came into the world, and revealed objects and interests which should fix for ever the wandering affections of mankind; remarking hereupon how opportunely the Virgilian poetry appeared at that very interval when the Homeric and Æschylean regimen had failed to satisfy, and yet before revelation had rendered the consolations of poetry altogether unnecessary. Still, however, it was not either lost or nullified in the Church which finally enshrined it, but as it was originally com-

patible with the purity of Hebrew worship at the beginning of things, so now, in this latter time, it has continued to flourish in and about the courts of the Christian sanctuary—in them, when the Church has possessed most completely the affections of its members—and is consequently, in its full action, the most poetical of all societies; *about* them more especially, when the Church has lost its hold; the high and fine feelings, which have been deprived of their proper channel, then bursting out all the more impetuously in consequence, and in the end producing a reaction—for the poetry thus elicited again fulfils its original office of exercising a sanatory influence on the mind, and thus paves the way a second time for better things. “Any great changes towards an improvement of the prevailing religious system,” says Mr. Keble, “have ever been heralded by an outburst of poetry.” Thus, while the truth of Mr. Wordsworth’s statement is admitted, that “poetry is as immortal as the heart of man,” Mr. Keble has the merit of having first traced out that *continuity* which is so essential to the very notion of life, independently of its adding so greatly to its interest. He has discovered, we might almost say, the “volcanic band” which unites the great vents and spiracles of the moral world, analogous to that which modern observation has detected in the physical.

The drift of the author’s comments on the works of the individual writers is the same in kind, and the execution is equally successful. The object in each instance has been to trace an unity and a connexion of the highest kind, the correspondence, namely, of the sentiments and other materials of the composition with the circumstances and sentiments of the writer, more especially with the one dominant feeling which is ascertained in various ways to be the key-note of his poetry. It is particularly worthy of observation how beautifully the nice shades of the poet’s character, and even the minutæ of his rank and situation in life, have been detected, by the combination of scattered notices which his works are found to exhibit, when submitted to a delicate and penetrating eye. To many, perhaps, who expect that the beauties of poetry should reveal themselves to the first hasty glance bestowed on them, these niceties will appear to be overstrained and superfluous refinements. Yet are they not after all in the true spirit of the often misapplied maxim, “*Ut pictura poesis?*” A good poem, like a good painting, is capable of being viewed in different lights and at different distances, and will supply new beauties at every successive examination. This is, in fact, the great practical difference between a good poem and a worthless one, that the novelty and freshness of the one is inexhaustible. How, indeed, can it be otherwise, when it is the mirror of that wonderful and mysterious world, the mind of a great poet?



Many examples of what we have been speaking are furnished in the course of Mr. Keble's commentaries on the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, which are carried on through several successive lectures, and are the first test and application of the proposed theory. The general result is, that much the same has been done for Homer by Mr. Keble which was done for Shakespeare by Coleridge (and, indeed, the system of criticism adopted by the two writers is very similar throughout). As we have been taught to consider Shakespeare no longer as a poetical barbarian, but as a writer possessing taste and judgment equal to his other powers, so the judgment of Homer has been similarly brought prominently into notice in the present lectures. Nowhere, according to Mr. Keble, is this more evident than in the skill with which the poet has managed to enlist our sympathies in behalf of his Achilles, a matter the more difficult, inasmuch as, by his superior powers, and endowments, by the favour with which the Olympian deities uniformly attend him, by his being on the conquering side, and, consequently, incurring something of the envy which, ever more or less, attaches to success; by these and other circumstances he seems almost necessarily excluded from the pale of our affections. Yet it was essential that this ideal of superhuman heroism should be both loved and admired by the poet's hearers as much as by the poet himself. The end desired was effected, observes Mr. Keble, in a variety of ways: one of the most striking is the constant sense of premature death which perpetually occupies him, and which is skilfully alluded to by the poet at the very moment of his most exalted triumphs.

"He does not rush into the midst of slaughter and bloodshed with blind impetuosity, like the common crowd of combatants; nor does he waver between hope and fear, like those who wait the cast of a die, and wear a semblance of fortitude owing to the very uncertainty of their situation. But the mind of Achilles is fully prescient of the future, yet so fixed and steadfast, that you would suppose him to be rather meeting a death imposed on him by the law of destiny, than challenging it by a voluntary choice. Hence he evidently enough plays the part not merely of a brave warrior, but of a devoted and consecrated victim."—P. 95.

Thus, (to take one instance out of many,) when Achilles is described by Homer with all possible pomp and magnificence of language, as setting forth to battle arrayed in his celestial armour, and drawn by his immortal horses, the deficiency of interest likely to ensue upon the introduction of a being endowed with such supernatural power and splendour is wonderfully provided against in the fine lines which immediately follow:—

"Him then bespake his steed beneath the car,  
Fleet Xanthus; drooping was his head the while,  
And all his mane flowed downwards o'er the yoke,  
E'en to the ground; (it was the white-arm'd queen,

Juno divine, who gave him vocal power :)  
 'Mighty Achilles, we shall save thee still,  
 Yet is thy death-hour nigh, nor we the cause;  
 'Tis from great God and Fate omnipotent.  
 Fleet shall our course be as the Zephyr's breath,  
 Call'd lightest of the winds, yet doom'd art thou  
 Vanquish'd to fall by might of God and man.'  
 Thus far he spake, the Fates then stayed for aye  
 His utterance; and thus with swelling heart  
 Achilles answer made,—'Why, Xanthus, now  
 Oracular of death? Unfitting task!  
 Full well I know here am I doom'd to die,  
*Afar from sire beloved and mother dear,*  
 Yet, knowing all, I cease not, until Troy  
 Be fully gorged with war!' He said, and drove,  
 Shouting, amid the first ranks his firm steeds."

Never, surely, were the tragic elements of terror and pity more happily united in a single character! Observe, too, especially, the softening effect of his filial affection, his attachment to Patroclus, his love of his native country, and the characteristic circumstance, that he finally consents to resign the body of Hector, when moved, not by the prayers of Priam, but by the appeal made by the latter to the memory of his father Peleus. Such are some few out of the many instances collected by Mr. Keble from the single character of the Achilles, in illustration of the exquisite *judgment* of Homer, the "more than Phidian art with which he transmitted to all succeeding generations the true and lively lineaments of heroic virtue." Many others are supplied from different portions of the poem, with none of which we were more struck than with the observation, that the plot of the work is so admirably woven, that we can scarcely lay our hand on a single circumstance which does not grow naturally out of the preceding condition of things, but is employed simply as a sort of "*Deus à machinâ*" to bring about the requisite catastrophe.

To return, however, more immediately to the consideration of the *consistency* of the Homeric poetry. If any one can still entertain a doubt as to the real nature of the writer's inspiration, our author considers that all such scruples must be removed by an examination of that other "golden treasure of antiquity," the *Odyssey*, embodying as it does so completely a second remarkable manifestation of the heroic character, the passion for nautical adventure and discovery.

"Whereas at all times there have been two fields preeminently adapted for the display of heroic virtues, the one belonging to soldiers and the other to sailors, you see at once how admirably this pair of divine poems corresponds to such a division—the *Iliad* being most happily suited to the military world, and the *Odyssey* to the nautical. I refer to that kind of navigation which is pursued not for war, but for the sake of exploring unknown regions. This is generally the direction in which the fiery vigour of energetic minds is apt to display

itself, whenever war has been suspended for a more than ordinary period. The Greeks, accordingly, after the times of the Trojan war, were in much the same situation with the inhabitants of Europe, when the chivalrous ardour of the crusades had once subsided. A new harvest of glory and memorable feats immediately sprung up and was propagated in all directions. The result was that the ocean was unveiled, distant lands discovered, the wonders of nature, and the habits of savage tribes became familiar objects of knowledge. Here was a most fruitful field for poetry to enter on : nor was it suffered to lie fallow. For no one in that day composed poetry, without enlarging on the wanderings of virgins and knight-errants by sea and land, or mingling shipwrecks, marine monsters, and fabulous islands, with wars and combats. In brief, as often as we read Spenser, or the Italian models whom he imitated, we are reminded alternately of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Yet perhaps most of them, not excepting even Virgil himself, were unwise in blending into the thread of a single narrative courses of life so different from each other. The observation, acknowledged by all of us, I fancy to be true in matters of the world, that he who keeps to one object through life is most successful, seems applicable also in a remarkable degree to epic narrative. Homer interests us more immediately and truly, writing as he has done, than if, like others, he had confounded together Achilles and Ulysses, and made a medley of maritime and military adventures."—Pp. 169, 170.

The author remarks, however, that there is yet a further element in the governing feeling of the *Odyssey* united with the former, though dissimilar to it, and this is the love of home and country, a combination of these two impulses being in reality a peculiar feature in the character of mariners. The character of Ulysses is toned as harmoniously to the spirit of the *Odyssey*, as that of Achilles to the *Iliad*, and accordingly the love of home is a predominant feature in his mind, which is fostered and excited to the very last by the scenes of tranquil home-life to which the poet with great art successively introduces him. To this it is that we owe the exquisite shifting panorama of the Phœnicians, the Lotophagi, Sicily, Æolia, the abode of Circe, and the beautiful cave and island of Calypso ; and much as this principal portion of the *Odyssey* has been admired and commented on, we think that the development of its peculiar force and interest has been reserved for Mr. Keble. As to Homer himself, it may be hardly necessary to add, after what has been said, that Mr. Keble never for a moment doubts the fact of his existence, or that he wrote both the works which have so long passed under his name ; the *Iliad* probably in his earlier years, the *Odyssey* in his later. This view he supports by a variety of interesting *internal* evidence, condescending, however, to touch slightly on one or two points affecting the *external* testimony (usually advanced on the opposite side), for the edification of those "*oculatiores*" who delight in raising doubts where there

is least room for them, and preferring their own imagined sagacity to the concurring testimony of all ages. The following is an interesting passage on the subject of his blindness :—

“ And here an interesting inquiry is suggested, whether Homer was blind at the time when he wrote the verses of which we are now in possession. At the first view, indeed, there seem no contemptible reasons why we should determine this in the negative. For how is the notion of his blindness to be reconciled with the introduction of so many pictures at once varied and accurate, and exhibiting every diversity of character, form, colour, motion, and gesture? Perhaps, however, on looking deeper, it will not be thought so incredible. For if any one will take the trouble to look well into the recesses of his own mind, he will find that in the moments in which he is most affected by the beauties of nature, there do not rise up before him distinct forms of woods, waters, mountains, and the like, in the order in which they would be delineated by a poet or a painter. But it is when the tumult of the mind has subsided, and rest has supervened, that the images previously massed confusedly together, then, as it were, unfold themselves in regular array; then every thing settles into its proper place, a space is interposed between us and them, we distinguish foreground, distance, and centre, and the relations of the several parts of the picture to each other. In short, memory performs a great part in the composition even of the most perfect picture. Moreover, let us imagine some painter of tenacious memory to be deprived of sight; will not such an one revert again and again to the images of those places especially which he knows most accurately, or is most intimately attached to? the more so when, in consequence of the loss of sight, the entrances of his mind are closed up, so that no new forms of things can possibly enter in and displace the old ones. Hence no one need be surprised that the blind sometimes possess a truer notion of the shapes and figures of objects than those who are in the possession of perfect sight; just as old men usually remember the transactions of their boyhood much more accurately than the young remember the events of yesterday. Considering, therefore, the fact that, throughout the whole *Odyssey*, cities, ports, and rivers are delineated with singular distinctness, whilst there is a less frequent employment of similes framed for the occasion and drawn from the general face of nature without any specification of particular places; and considering, on the other hand, that similes predominate in the *Iliad*, and little use is there made of actual and definite localities; the most satisfactory explanation, to my mind, which this circumstance admits of is, that the *Iliad* was written, when Homer's sight was yet unimpaired, the *Odyssey*, at least the greater part of it, during his blindness. \* \* \* To this subject belong especially those beautiful lines on Demodocus, which it would be unpardonable to pass unnoticed :

‘ Now did the herald nigh advance, and by the hand he led  
The ever-welcome minstrel-bard, dear to the Muse, they said;  
The Muse who gave him good and ill, a blessing with his wrong,  
And while amercing him of sight requited him with song.

Then did Pontonons for him, amid the festive hall,  
Dispose a silver-studded seat against a column tall;  
Above, suspended from a pin, hung down the tuneful lyre,  
The herald guided it aright to be taken by the sire,  
And by him set a table fair, and did a charger fill,  
And by him set a cup of wine to drink of at his will."

Pp. 240—242.

These lines, introduced by the author, as being so beautifully indicative of Homer's resignation and tranquillity in his blindness, lead us to speak of a view of heathen poetry advocated by Mr. Keble, and frequently illustrated in these lectures, yet far from being generally admitted or acknowledged, and at the same time very striking, we should imagine, and captivating to most minds on its being first presented to them; we mean, the way in which he connects the religion of the better part of the pagan world with that with which revelation has blessed ourselves, regarding the former not as altogether erroneous or worthless, because superseded by a better, (the common opinion of most persons,) but rather as the first indistinct vision and obscure contemplation of truths afterwards declared, the impassioned expression of an earnest gaze, looking for the first dawn of approaching light; and thus not only poetically interesting, but, much more than this, becoming a vehicle of grave instruction, and forming likewise the only really strong bond of sympathy between us and them; the study which, without such a link of connexion, might have been unblest, being sanctified in consequence:

"What seemed an idol-hymn now breathes of Thee,  
Tuned by Faith's ear to some celestial melody."

For instance, when Minerva is introduced by Homer as condescending to assume the guise of a shepherd, a messenger, or a herald, or to watch the fall of a quoit flung by Ulysses, and proclaim him victor, this is clearly at variance with the canon laid down by Horace, that a god should only interfere when there is a superhuman difficulty to be solved, and many accordingly may have regarded such passages as puerilities unworthy of heroic poetry; yet, in spite of the canon, they are neither out of season nor deficient in deep beauty and interest, if only viewed as remarkable anticipations of the revealed doctrine of a particular providence. A similar instance of faith on the poet's part is instanced by Mr. Keble, in the circumstance that "his gods so frequently disclose themselves to brave and good men as their present guardians, by tokens, minute indeed, yet to the persons themselves sufficiently intelligible." Indeed he regards the whole of the *Odyssey* as a poem strictly religious in its scope and character; and this view is expanded at large in the fifteenth prelection, one of the most interesting of the series.

It is to *Æschylus*, however, that we turn, if we wish to see the full extent to which the above-mentioned principle is capable

of application. In this poet we may safely say, that with the rejection of it is involved the rejection of the grandest element of his inspiration, and a very inadequate conception of his poetry must be the consequence. The clue of all his writings must be found, if anywhere, in the depth of his religious contemplations. His path lay along the mysterious ocean of God's providence, and he gathered the treasures which it cast up. What wonder, then, if these fragments may be identified with the discoveries of those more highly favoured men for whom the waves have partially retreated, and whose steps extend far out over the sands towards the remote and central fountains of the great deep itself.

We subjoin, in illustration, some of Mr. Keble's remarks on the famous *Æschylean* chorus, "miserably distorted," he observes, "by the acumen of interpreters." After quoting the lines on the omen of the hare devoured by the pair of eagles, and Diana's compassion for them, he proceeds:—

"The poet herein touches on a subject than which few can be more gravely important, or more full of holy religion and tender feeling, the idea, namely, that there is a wonderful agreement and connexion uniting gods and men with the race of birds, beasts, and other irrational animals; so that their very notes, gestures, and motions, should almost of necessity raise or depress the minds of the superior beings. Accordingly it has always been popularly believed that dogs and horses divine, by a sort of presentiment, the coming misfortunes of the family, nay, give warning, as far as they can, by tokens sufficiently intelligible."—Pp. 339, 340.

Afterwards follows the corresponding Scriptural view of the same mystery:—

"We learn from Holy Writ that there is a certain sympathy and connexion between animals and the human race, both in its depression and in its aspirations towards a higher state. 'The whole creation,' it is written, 'groaneth and travaileth in pain together till now.' Nor are the promises unfrequent of the prophets, pointing to all appearance in the same direction:

'The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb,  
And the leopard shall lie down with the kid,  
And the calf and the young lion and the fatling together,  
And a little child shall lead them.'

"It would be, of course, in accordance with our natural expectations that the tribes of animals should also derive some advantage from the salvation of man, suffering so severely as they have done, not only at the period of the deluge, but in all times and places, for the wickedness and sins of man. Therefore, although I am far from denying that the law of the Divine conduct towards brute animals is still one of the deepest of mysteries, yet we see that all things are now advancing from



bondage into freedom, and know for certain that the Divine mercy, which has so amply benefited ourselves, will not be withheld from them."—P. 349.

Again, after quoting and paraphrasing the lines,

"One was there great awhile,  
Of might o'erflowing, irresistible,  
Now dumb and passed away;  
And he who next appear'd  
Hath found his conqueror and fled:  
But who shall solemnize the name of Jove  
In zealous and triumphal song,  
He shall make wisdom his;"

he remarks on the latter clause:—

"Words these well worthy even of an oracle, and in effect not far differing from that truly divine language of the Psalmist,

"Thou hast rebuked the heathen and destroyed the ungodly :  
Thou hast put out their name for ever and ever.

"O thou enemy, destructions are come to a perpetual end, even as the cities which thou hast destroyed : their memorial is perished with them.

"But the Lord shall endure for ever : He hath also prepared His seat for judgment.

"For He shall judge the world in righteousness : and minister true judgment unto His people."

To the same effect are the following observations:—

"Again, there is something of diviner doctrine in the following passage, where we are taught that calamities are employed by the Supreme Ruler for the cleansing of our souls and as the remedy of vice. Thus he praises Jove, as one,

'Who guided mortal man  
In wisdom's paths, his law establishing  
That pain is gain.'

"According to Æschylus' teaching, then, it is so ordered that men should always gain some knowledge from suffering, and that not by a sort of self-evolving thread of destiny, but by the free choice and law of God himself.

'In slumber on the heart  
Distilleth drop by drop  
The pain of unforgotten ill,  
And e'en the unwilling learn  
Discreet obedience.'

"With no common beauty does he describe, as I think, in this passage, the still warnings of conscience dropping like the dew from heaven, such as present themselves even in dreams to an anxious and watchful mind. Lastly, that none may suppose such thoughts to arise of their own accord, without any perceptible aid from heaven, observe especially those closing lines, full of sweetness and piety,

'By mercies to the unwilling shewn,  
 Oft and again is wrought  
 Strongly constrained acknowledgment  
 Of the Divinities on holy thrones.'

"I know of no heathen writer, with the exception of *Æschylus*, who has reached that height in sacred wisdom, which teaches that not only are the inmost thoughts of sleepers visibly manifest to the great Creator, but are even, as it were, guided and formed and fashioned by Him; and that thus even our secret thoughts upon our beds derive power in some sort from the throne of God."—Pp. 350—353.

We have said enough, perhaps, in illustration of the religious source of the *Æschylean* poetry, to give some idea of Mr. Keble's method of tracing out the connexion and relative bearings of the greatest of the works of *Æschylus*, the *Orestean* trilogy, which he regards as a general recantation, written in maturer life, of the doctrine advocated in the *Prometheus*, wherein *Æschylus* had represented Almighty goodness disjoined from Almighty power. The whole comment is admirably executed; but, from its fulness and intricacy, cannot be done justice to by any brief analysis or quotation of particular passages. Let it suffice to add only the beautiful close of the disquisition on the *Eumenides*:—

"Thus at length, having run through the entire circuit of sorrow and crime, the poet wills that our minds should fall back into their original tranquillity. Both first and last he has regarded the tutelary protection of the gods, more especially of *Jove*, all-merciful and almighty, as the sole means of safety. At the opening, the prayers of the Greeks supplicating at *Delphi* had been received, above all other gods, by '*Jove*, the perfect and most high;' and so, too, at the termination,

'The Sire vouchsafes respect for those  
 Who shelter 'neath *Minerva's* wing.'

Thus you see, as in music, so in this noble piece of poetry or philosophy, call it which you will, the harmony is well closed with the same note which first broke silence:—

'From *Jove*, ye *Muses*, wake the strain, and let it end in *Jove*!'"

Pp. 437, 438.

It can hardly fail to be noticed how fine an illustration these and such like passages supply of the well-known beautiful lines in the *Christian Year*, on the "*Spoiling of the Heathen*:"

"The olive wreath, the ivied wand,  
 The sword in myrtles dress'd,  
 Each legend of the shadowy strand  
 Now wakes a vision blest:  
 As little children lip and tell of heaven,  
 So thoughts beyond their thought to those high bards were given."

It may be worth while, however, to subjoin Mr. Keble's general summary of the scheme of the *Æschylean* trilogy, if only for

the sake of the comparison therein instituted between this poet and Sophocles, as well as for the vindication of Æschylus himself from the charge of upholding the doctrine, often attributed to him, of a blind and indiscriminating fatalism.

"We have now shewn it to be credible that the poet in framing this noble trilogy, which commences with the Agamemnon, had in view an object far different from that of the common herd of tragedians. The intention of these latter is generally to conduct the fortunes of any particular family, or state, as it may happen, to some already recognised and generally received termination,—justice they pay no particular attention to, so long as they can work out the requisite conclusion by some ingenious series of events. For instance, what else does Sophocles himself, in his famous *Edipus*, but deliver over to execution, like a devoted victim, a man not only guiltless, but even of the highest merits, disposing everything for his destruction as aptly and appropriately as if Divine Providence took an actual pleasure in laying snares for the innocent? Far different, and far better, was the line adopted by Æschylus, whose especial object it is, both himself to advocate the scheme of the divine government in this world, and to assign the same office to others. The essence of his tragedies is contained, not in the narration of what befell Agamemnon, Prometheus, or *Edipus*, but in a clear and conspicuous development of the counsels of the Supreme Ruler respecting their several fortunes.

"Now, whoever, following this clue, will carefully examine the series of which the Agamemnon is the commencement, will find the difference of its component parts to be, if I mistake not, something of this kind. First, in the Agamemnon itself men darkly and obscurely anticipate the vengeance of God, to descend after a long interval; being taught partly by express prophecies, and partly by the circumstances of the case, that punishment will one day be inflicted. Next, in the *Choëphoræ*, we have grave oracles occurring, and the express injunctions and ministers of the gods. Lastly, in the third place, the Eumenides assign the whole matter to be arranged by the divine powers themselves, namely Apollo and Minerva, the interpreters of the Supreme will. The plot, therefore, of the entire poem is first woven in the Agamemnon, then becomes more intricate and difficult in the *Choëphoræ*,—and the final denouement takes place in the Eumenides; yet, after all, so framed, that we are not so much initiated thereby into the scheme of the divine counsels, as commanded to be silent before the majesty of Almighty God."—Pp. 357, 358.

In illustration of this last clause, (the sum of the Æschylean theology,) it is elsewhere remarked, that the views of this poet may be suitably compared with the Book of Job in Scripture, where the discussion on the hard lot of mortality is similarly closed by a reference to the supreme will of the sole Governor of the world, who, being *confessed* to be Omnipotent, must also be *conceded* to be a God of perfect equity.

We must pass over the author's lectures on Pindar, full as

they are of very interesting observations on the peculiar character of lyric poetry, especially with regard to the management of metrical numbers; its employment of the intricate measures of the ode, or, in modern times, the sonnet, being in direct accordance with the law of reserve which is so leading a feature in Mr. Keble's system. Nor can we afford to notice the comments on Euripides, further than to mention that Mr. Keble is at first decidedly inclined to exclude him from his list of primary poets, but on closer examination considers that a native vein of feeling may, after all, be discovered in him, of which in the close of his prelection on the subject, he gives the following summary:—

"In conclusion, Euripides shall be enrolled among the number of those poets who have drawn their song from the fountain of their own affections; on the ground that he adopts and sympathizes in feelings common to the *generality* of men, at the same time with a particular regard and affection for the life led by those persons, who, being ministers and servants of the gods, think it their duty to devote themselves exclusively to divine offices, to despise pleasure, and to be unoccupied with worldly business."—Pp. 609, 610.

The reasons on which this view is grounded will easily present themselves to the readers of the Euripidean tragedies, more especially the Hippolytus and the Ion. We proceed to speak of the two great poets of nature, Lucretius and Virgil, with whom the series of prelections closes. The comments referring to this department of the art, and comprised in the last half of the second volume, are, we think, some of the most interesting portions of the work. Its attractions, like those of a well-written novel, increase as we approach the end.

The vein of inspiration in Lucretius is not difficult to recognise,—it is comprised in one word, Infinity. Whatever in nature is vast, profound, obscure, and indefinite, the depths of space, the rapidity of light, the motions of clouds and winds, all these are the materials of his poetry; and hence his attachment to that otherwise most unpoetical philosophy, the system of Epicurus; the doctrine of atoms, sublime in their minuteness and celerity, as well as infinite in number, having naturally great charms for an imagination such as his. Mr. Keble quotes the following passage in illustration:—

"All things before our eyes each other bound;  
Air fenceth Hills about, and Mountains Air;  
Land girdeth Ocean, and the Sea all Lands;  
But the great Whole hath limitation none:  
So then there is a Space, a vast profound,  
Which all bright rivers, everlastingly  
Flowing along it, never would pass o'er,  
Never have less beyond them as they flow'd;  
Thus prodigally spreads the world of things,  
Illimitably opening on all sides."

And again, the lines on the upper sphere of infinite and transparent æther; written, one would imagine, by the sea-side, on the stillest of summer evenings:—

“Then sea, then air, then Æther starr'd with fires,  
All unalloy'd were left in liquid forms,  
Each lighter than the rest; Æther supreme,  
Most liquid, and most light, embosom'd floats  
On th' undulating air; nor ever blends  
His fluent body with its weltering waves  
In gusty motion:—be it rack'd at will  
With violent whirlwind, or in tempests rage  
Uncertain,—on he wafts his fires the while,  
In steady draught and unremitting sweep.”

Without, however, dwelling on a point which will be conceded at once by every reader of Lucretius, (no other poet, we think, bearing such unequivocal testimony, on the very surface of his writings, to Mr. Keble's principle,) we pass on to some other interesting features brought under notice in this poet; among which must be observed the extreme simplicity of the materials which he employs. A little air and water will furnish him with arguments and illustrations for an entire poem. He is, in this respect, aptly compared by Mr. Keble with the author of the *Divina Commedia*, of whom it is remarked, that—

“Dante is almost the only poet who has correctly handled a subject in which the generality of poets have made a disgraceful failure. The custom of these latter has invariably been to transfer gross and earthly objects into the Elysium or Paradise which they describe. Dante, on the contrary, admits into his æther neither lovely gardens, nor the purest beauty of visible forms, confining himself entirely to three things, Light, Motion, and Song.”—Pp. 678, 679.

The observation of this extreme *simplicity* of material in the construction of Lucretius' poem, leads the author into an interesting digression, on the subject of the various marvels and strange phenomena of nature, which appear to be, in the opinion of most writers, so indispensable for the decoration of their poetry. Mr. Keble does not hesitate to condemn altogether this method of attempting to dazzle and bewilder the mind of the reader, by making a parade of the wonderful. He strongly upholds the maxim inculcated by Horace, that “poems ought to be sweet, as well as beautiful,” and consequently has no sympathy with any mere attempts at the production of *effect*, the one great aim of those poets who deal largely in descriptions of American birds, Indian figs, banyans, and other similar curiosities. The charm of such poems, if they have any, is, he observes, to be sought elsewhere; and he gives two methods, by which the above-mentioned Horatian precept may be complied with, and such foreign materials be employed consistently with

true poetry. One of these is, where the whole poem proceeds according to a certain *analogy*; the habits, manners, and religion of some one particular nation, being adopted, as shadows of truths, characters, or principles, which are higher and more universal :—

“For example,” says Mr. Keble, “no one among modern poets has found his way to the heart more completely than the author of ‘Thalaba,’ in the narration of his hero’s childhood, his wanderings, and final victory, purchased at the price of his own life. Yet the whole tenor of the fable, judging merely from the language, is in commendation of the religion of Mahomet. Nevertheless, it has pleased, and will continue to please, if I mistake not, the servants of true piety and religion; for the most part, by reason of a silent comparison instituted in the mind of the reader. We feel, namely, as we read, what would have been the disposition of a man, who acts in this or that manner in obedience to a fictitious creed, when he had once tasted the privileges of a sounder and purer piety. Nay, good men are similarly pleased in the present day, in the reading of the old poets, by a similar substitution; taking what Homer or Pindar may have said in praise of their imaginary Jupiter, as if it had been obscurely uttered of God Almighty, His prophecies, and true sacrifice. Thus, on either hand, provision is made for religious modesty; sincere piety shuns the eyes and light of the world, and veils itself according to the occasion; at one time in the system of the old classic poets, at another in that of those modern nations who are still in error.”—P. 665.

The second method, by which materials strange to the poet himself may be made poetically interesting, is both more subtle, and more universally applicable. It seems just one of those points which an imitator, however skilful, would be sure to overlook; nay, would probably despise as merely the result of accident, if it were pointed out to him; and is, accordingly, one of the best examples which could be given of Mr. Keble’s nice and discriminating taste. We will give his view, as nearly as we can follow it, in his own language :—

“It is, if we may credit Horace, a great proof of poetic power ‘to make a common subject your own’ by your method of handling it (‘*propriè communia dicere*’). We must at present, however, in a certain sense, invert this precept, and rather praise a writer for ‘making his own subject common.’ I will explain what I mean by an example. Let us suppose some English painter to draw trees, animals, or towns, with the figures and deportment of their inhabitants, such as he conceives them to be in Africa, or any other part of the world. The whole work, however, will exhibit something of that natural colouring, which is common alike to all places and countries. There will be the light of the sky and sun, the sea, the herbage, and the alternating play of light and shadow. And it will be in consequence



of this, that the mind will rise to the perception of the *whole*, without being coldly and unprofitably occupied in running the round of the *particulars*. Now, the same principle probably holds good in poetry; so that, in fact, poems dealing with natural and rural objects may be made capable of producing pleasure, if only there be some mention, however slight and obscure, of things and objects, which, being equally diffused throughout the world in general, are consequently capable of exciting universal interest; for instance, of the depth of sky or ocean, the sounds of forests, and the flow of waters. Take, for an example, the following noble picture of Virgil's, a master artist in matters of this kind:—

'Nor is there not amid Calabrian glades  
A serpent ill, who coils a scaly back  
With breast upraised, and length of belly streak'd  
With ample spots: he, long as streams well out  
From any fountains, and while earth is drench'd  
By the moist spring-tide and the wat'ry South,  
Haunts the wet fens, and on the bank makes home;  
With fish or frog loquacious his dark maw  
Gorging insatiate: but when dry the marsh,  
And scorch'd the gaping earth, abroad he flies  
O'er arid ground; fierce glare his eyes of flame,  
While through the fields, infuriate with thirst,  
He rages, scared and madden'd by the heat.'

"Observe, we even seem to see him as he glides along; yet, if the truth be told, I find that there is still something wanting to complete the passage; so that it may be shewn, in short, to be written with the pen, not so much of a student in natural history, as of a poet: this deficiency is supplied, and with great beauty, by the lines immediately following:—

'Ah! never then be mine *in open day*  
To court soft slumbers, or to *lie reclined*  
'Mid *herbage of the grove*; when all renew'd  
In fresh attire, and bright with youthful prime,  
Or brood or eggs in covert haply left,  
Towering he rolls him to the sunny beam,  
And darts around a triple-pointed tongue.'

"The expressions, '*in open day*,' and '*lie reclined 'mid herbage of the grove*,' seem in some wise to bring the whole matter into the sphere of common feeling; much in the same way as musicians interweave occasionally some simple and popular melody into an elaborate composition. Thus a warmth of sympathy is kindled in the minds of persons who would otherwise have bestowed only a cold commendation."—Pp. 666—668.

The subject of Lucretius' madness, confirmed by the general tradition of his time, was alluded to in the discussion of Mr. Keble's theory, with which it harmonizes very satisfactorily; and there are not a few features in the poem itself, which favour the supposition. But it must be further noticed, that he regards madness in general, and more especially in times antecedent to

the Gospel, as corresponding with those cases of possession by evil spirits which occur so frequently in Scripture narrative; and thus, as invested with all the interest attaching to a closer than ordinary connexion with the unseen world.

"Who will assert," he says, "that lunatics in the present day are unaffected by the power of evil demons, exhibiting, as they do, exactly the same symptoms with the maniacs recorded in Holy Writ? How much more credible then is it, that in the old times, before the heaven was opened, spirits, whether good or evil, uttered at times oracles of their own, when they had gained possession of some mind of the diviner sort, but not entirely under its own control; as was the case, in my opinion, with Lucretius."—P. 694.

It is worthy of notice, that this view of madness, in confirmation of which Mr. Keble quotes the general opinion of antiquity, that the most celebrated heathen oracles were the organs of demoniacal agency, is borne out in a remarkable degree by the testimony of some of the missionaries in the Polynesian Islands, at least if the statements of the natives on this subject may be in any degree relied on; but, without dwelling on the reasons adducible in its favour, we may observe, that it is in no way inconsistent with the high moral, and even religious tone, which, in spite of his philosophy, pervades Lucretius' poetry; Mr. Keble well observing, that it is "usual with the Supreme Ruler to confirm and announce His own will, by the compulsory testimony of His enemies, whether they be mortals or evil spirits." The religious character of this poet's mind is, indeed, especially remarkable. Many are there who, professing reverence for Sacred Truth, have been its worst enemies; but the case is an uncommon one of a writer verbally denying its existence, yet in reality sanctioning and supporting it with all the powers of his poetry. This subject is treated at large, and with great effect, in the thirty-fifth prælection, from which we content ourselves with a single extract:—

"Who does not see that he laid the foundation of better things than his master Epicurus could attain to; when, for example, he deploras the miserable condition of mortality in such mournful numbers and language as the following?—

"Were men but able, feeling as they do  
A weight upon the soul full wearisome,  
To know its causes, and from whence it grows,  
This burden of great misery on the heart,  
They would not lead the life that now they lead,  
Wanting they know not what, and seeking still  
By change of place to lay aside the load."

"I remark, that all who have written verse have employed their powers upon this subject. To sing dirges and laments over the frailty and transitoriness of life is a field in which all great poets love to

expatiate. But Lucretius, if I mistake not, possesses this peculiar and even singular excellence, that he does not so much complain of the short and narrow boundaries of life, as of the whole condition of our existence in this world, be it ever so well passed; he signifies that it is this, and nothing else, which always has been, and will be, the heaviest of burdens to each living individual. Recall to mind, for instance, how different from these lines are the elegiacs on the death of Bion, beautiful as these latter are:—

'Alas! alas! the Mallow-flow'rs, that in the garden fade,  
Green Parsley, and soft Anise, in its loveliness array'd,  
Revive again another year, and bloom in second birth;  
Whilst we, the mighty, and the strong, the wise ones of the earth,  
Unconscious in the hollow ground abide, when once we die,  
Long, long, and unawaken'd, in eternal sleep to lie!'

"This writer complains that life has past so rapidly, and that when once buried, there is no possibility of revisiting the light of day. He is altogether silent upon what is so much more grievous, that life itself is irksome, even in the midst of its enjoyments. Moreover, he performs the part of a mourner in such sort, that he seems, at the same time, to be walking leisurely and tranquilly in some lovely and verdant spot; whilst in Lucretius the thing is related in plain and appropriate language, as is the wont of those who, when their heart is full, give utterance to their sentiments without attending to the graces of style."—Pp. 698, 699.

It is suggested by Mr. Keble, in the course of his lectures, as an important and interesting subject of investigation, whether and in what degree the revelation of a true religion may be considered favourable, or not, to the general interests of poetry. He has not, indeed, undertaken explicitly to determine a question which would necessitate his entering, in order to do it justice, upon so wide a field of speculation; but, as far as his opinion is expressed on particular and minor departments of the art, and judging also from the general tone of his lectures, he is disposed, we think, to consider that poetry has not been injured in this respect, even if we cannot assert it to have been positively benefited. For instance, with regard to an important province of the art, the whole world of the brute creation, he remarks, that while on the one hand we have, of course, lost the poetry, (of which *Æschylus* made so much use,) connected with the Pythagorean doctrine of animals, as subject to transmigration, yet that this is compensated, on the other hand, by that deep mystery of the connexion of their fortunes and ours, which Scripture indicates, but still leaves in obscurity. Now, an observation, tending to confirm this view of the question alluded to, may be made, we believe, on the different styles or schools of poetry, of which Lucretius and Virgil are severally the representatives. It might be plausibly argued, that while, independently of religion, these two lines of poetry might have run on in their main features as distinct as ever, perpetually parallel,

and never meeting; yet, that the natural effect of Divine Truth, when generally received into the world, and especially when heartily embraced by the poets of the period, would be, not indeed, to destroy their poetry, but at any rate to obscure it,—to round off its edges, as it were, and efface from its features their original peculiarities of expression; thus merging it altogether into a third species, which might, indeed, be included under the general title of *religious* poetry, but which would furnish no points of difference striking enough to permit of its arrangement according to any other classification. Yet, how does the case actually stand? We have, it is believed, what we may well call a crucial instance of the reverse being the truth; that is to say, we have two poets in the present day, both of a high order, both deeply imbued with Religion, and even closely in sympathy together on all points of the highest moment, whose compositions, therefore, might, on the whole, be expected to be in style and inspiration extremely similar; yet the lines of their poetry are, if we mistake not, as distinctly separate as those of the first authors of their respective schools. The writers to whom we refer are, the author of *The Cathedral*, and the author of *The Christian Year* himself. Surely, in Mr. Williams and Mr. Keble, the different notes of the Lucretian and Virgilian music, far from being blended together into an indistinguishable medley by time and distance, are, in the main, faithfully echoed back in all their original distinctness and individuality of character. To the readers of Mr. Williams's poetry this must, we think, be so evident, that quotation would be wasted in support of it. Let the lines in *The Baptistery*, on the Years of Eternity, be referred to, as one example out of many, in which the mystery of Infinity in Time is treated in a corresponding manner to the Lucretian passage, previously quoted, on the Infinity of Space. Nor is Mr. Keble's especial preference for Virgil obscurely indicated; if we may augur, not only from the soft and tender tone of feeling which characterizes either writer, as though to minister consolation "to sick hearts and weary spirits" were their appointed office, but also from those minuter touches, particularly in descriptions of nature, wherein Virgil appears to have been his model, and which, perhaps, more than any other circumstance, would indicate a community of sentiment. How perfectly Virgilian are the following lines in the *Sea Service*:—

"The shower of moonlight falls as still and clear  
 Upon the desert main,  
 As when sweet flow'rs some pastoral garden cheer  
 With fragrance after rain:  
 The wild winds rustle in the piping shrouds  
 As in the quivering trees;  
 Like summer fields beneath the shadowy clouds  
 The yielding waters darken in the breeze."

Moreover, in his remarks on Virgil, Mr. Keble comments with particular pleasure on those more *elaborately finished* landscapes which are so peculiar to this writer among the classics, and which he considers to refute completely the assertion of some critics, (we believe Dr. Copleston among the number,) who deny any thorough appreciation of the picturesque to the ancient poets. The beautiful lines at the beginning of the seventh *Æneid*, describing the night-voyage along the shore on which Circe's dwelling was situate, are quoted by him in evidence. And may not these, again, be paralleled with the highly-wrought pictures which occasionally present themselves in the Christian Year, and which we believe are never to be found in Lucretius or Mr. Williams? For instance, in the lines on the Burial Service, we find as follows:—

“Waft him, thou soft September breeze,  
And gently lay him down,  
Within some circling woodland wall,  
Where bright leaves, redd'ning as they fall,  
Wave gaily o'er the waters brown;  
And let some graceful arch be there,  
With wreathed mullions proud,  
With burnish'd ivy for its screen,  
And moss that glows as fresh and green,  
As though beneath an April cloud.”

Other arguments might be adduced, but perhaps enough has been said in support of the point which we contend for. Let us proceed to notice some of the instances in which the muse of Virgil, comparatively so much disparaged by critics of the present day, has been done justice to by his admirers. The commencement of Virgil's decline in modern opinion may be dated, probably, from the period of the reaction, produced chiefly by the writings of Mr. Wordsworth, against the gaudy and unmeaning phraseology of the school of Pope. The language of Coleridge is usually re-echoed;—“Take away Virgil's diction and metre, and what do you leave him?” The argument itself would probably be stated something in the following manner:—All the earliest poets of every nation have, it is said, written to embody their lofty thoughts, and have adopted the simple and natural expressions which the thoughts suggested; but, in consequence of their frequently employing the language of passion, which is not that of quiet and ordinary life, succeeding writers, observing the fact, but ignorant of the cause of it, imagined that the secret of poetry was contained in the use of an extravagant and artificial phraseology, and that hence gradually sprung up that incongruous combination of terms usually denominated “Poetic diction.” This is accordingly stated as a principle generally applicable to the poetry of all countries, that the first compositions are remarkable for their truth and

simplicity of expression, the later ones for their attempts at verbal embellishments; and thus Virgil, it is argued, attempted to improve, unsuccessfully, upon the severe style and language of Lucretius.

This argument is best met, not by denying the truth or importance of the principle which it advocates, but rather its applicability to the particular instance. Not but that a certain degree of ornament and polish may in any case be reasonably permitted to a writer, as long as it be kept subordinate to points of higher consequence; just as we may well admire the simple majesty of early Gothic architecture, yet without necessarily condemning the decorated style which followed it. But if it be urged that Virgil has transgressed these limits, and that he employs florid or magnificent language merely as a disguise for sentiments in themselves trivial and unpoetical, these lectures, without directly noticing the charge, often as it is repeated, furnish, notwithstanding, a satisfactory and adequate refutation of it. This is done, first, by showing that Virgil writes from a fountain of real feeling, and therefore that his productions consist of something more than mere sound and language; and secondly, by proving that the chief part of what would probably be called by most persons simply ornamental diction, is a true growth and offshoot from his poetry. And first with regard to his vein of inspiration. It is so clearly and expressly indicated by himself that his affections were fixed on nature—

“Rivers and woods inglorious let me love—”

that Mr. Keble considers it must have been almost impossible for the majority of critics to have overlooked this fact, were it not for the circumstance that Virgil also composed an epic which imposed on them at once by its high-sounding title and pretensions. With regard then to the *Æneid*, the author states his approval of the suggestion originally made by the late Mr. Froude, that it was written probably at the request of Augustus, who, having restored to Virgil his estate, of which he, along with many others, had been despoiled in order to recompense the soldiery, had established thereby a lasting claim on the poet's gratitude, and for which no return in the eyes of Virgil could be too ample. Be this, however, as it may, it is remarkable that Virgil himself was so dissatisfied with the production as to leave his dying orders that it should be destroyed; and Mr. Keble has proved it to exhibit sufficient evidence in itself that heroic poetry was not his appropriate province. Thus he remarks (what is so generally complained of) the utter want of character and individuality, not only in the subordinate actors but even in *Æneas*; while Homer and Shakespeare, on the contrary, invariably distinguish every personage introduced by



them, however short and insignificant may be the part he plays, by some feature or another peculiar to himself. So again it is observed, that in his descriptions of battles, Virgil evinces his undisguised hatred of war and bloodshed, describing these in all their horrors, and bending over and commiserating the dead. The following comment on this head is also particularly worthy of notice:—

“What, if I shew that the author himself hates in a manner his own foster-child, and visits him with extremity of punishment? Such, however, is the tenor of the entire narrative which relates to Dido. The whole subject is so managed, as to make it seem to us clearly unjust and shocking, if Æneas is at last to escape with impunity: Virgil leads us to look forward with something of exultation to the period of his approaching destruction:—

‘If of necessity that wicked One  
Must reach the fated ports and float to shore,  
(Jove willing this, and such the appointed end,)  
Yet plagued with wars and strife by a brave race,  
A homeless exile, from Iulus torn,  
Help let him supplicate; and see his friends  
Die shameful deaths; nor may he finally,  
When bound by law of ignominious peace,  
Enjoy or realm or happy day desired,  
But fall before his time, amid the sands,  
Unburied! Such my prayer, my latest words,  
Which with mine ebbing life-blood now I pour!’

These words, as uttered by a dying person, are prophetic, and are received not without satisfaction by all who approve that perjury shall be visited with punishment.”—Pp. 724, 725.

Accordingly, the problem of the Æneid being satisfactorily solved, there remains no reason for doubting that the source of the Virgilian poetry lies in the world of nature, the Eclogues and Georgics bearing ample testimony that he entered fully and heartily into the occupations of rustic life; nay, even the Æneid itself affording direct evidence of this taste, in what are perhaps its most interesting passages, those namely, in which he catches at the opportunity presented by his subject, of escaping from the tumult of war and action, to linger about the objects on which his affections centred. One of the most striking examples which Mr. Keble quotes in illustration of this, is the description of Æneas' voyage up the Tiber on his first arrival in Italy.

A vindication of Virgil's style and use of language is perhaps most effectually supplied in those passages where Mr. Keble treats of the poetical reserve so remarkable in this poet; a reserve increased probably by the want of sympathy with his own tastes, which Virgil, if the conjectures respecting the Æneid have any truth in them, must have experienced among the people of his day.

"Nothing in all Virgil," says Mr. Keble, "is so Virgilian as the fourth Georgic, and this turns, the greater portion of it, on an implied comparison of the generals, the tribes, and the battles of the bees, with those of the Romans."—P. 752.

Now this same book would probably be the one, according to some critics, most liable to censure, as being more especially a repository of trivial sentiments recommended by pompous diction. Yet what, in fact, is this language, but that peculiar tone of irony in which Virgil's reserve is so generally manifested? Let us hear Mr. Keble on this point:—

"Virgil is frequently humorous in treating of these subjects, and employs a peculiar irony of his own; much in the same way as mothers are accustomed to play with their infants, at once concealing and expressing the overflow of their affection,—that is to say, the affection escapes of itself, but they wish to conceal it, because they know that to others it will appear extravagant and ridiculous. Why should we not suppose that to the same class belong those expressions so commonly employed in Virgil, when he speaks of the habits and tempers of brute animals, replete as they are with that peculiar 'tenderness and humour' which Horace notices in this poet? Be assured that there generally lurks, under the shew of playfulness, something either deeper, or more tender, than would be readily tolerated by the majority of readers."—P. 750.

And, elsewhere it is added:—

"Not that Virgil was conscious of the full force and application of these expressions; but he uttered them according to the occasion, (a no uncommon case,) by a sort of secret instinct; even in this point resembling the superior class of rustics, whose language frequently exceeds themselves in wisdom."—P. 753.

Another manner of expressing himself, very commonly occurring in this poet, is observable in his custom of investing trees or plants with human feelings and sensations. And here, again, the author is careful to distinguish something more than mere verbal decoration, inasmuch as he connects this language with the lively and peculiar interest evinced by rustics in the productions of the country, more especially in whatever they have themselves reared and cultivated; the faith

"— that every flower  
Enjoys the air it breathes"

belonging to the farmer even more appropriately than to the poet.

Lastly, we must not omit all notice of Virgil's frequent employment of "proper names," a point on which he is so very generally accused of being cold and artificial; Mr. Keble, however, looks deeper into the matter, and is, we think, more than usually happy in his comments on this feature of the poet's

style, in which he recognises great and varied beauty. One of its chief uses, according to him, is to *localize* the description, or subject of which the verses treat, and thereby to invest it with greater truth and reality; as when a person adds the minute particulars of time and place, in his narration of a story. The author refers, in illustration to the well-known lines in which Virgil speaks of the old man whom he remembers to have seen "Beneath CEbalia's turrets high,"—and to the passage of the echo, in the seventh *Æneid*, along the lake of Diana, the Nar, and the fountains of Velinus.

"I will give," he adds, "another and a still finer instance, the most affecting perhaps that could be found in this most tender of all writers. After having introduced into the war a certain priest, who was also a physician,—

‘ One who was wont by might of hand and song  
To shed soft slumbers on the viper kind,  
Or hydra dread with pestilential breath;  
Who tamed their movements, and by skill assuaged  
Their deadly bite; but skill or charm had none  
To heal the death-wound of a Trojan spear,  
Nor aught availed his sleep-constraining songs,  
Or herbs discovered on the Marsian hills ;’

he immediately stops at the mention of the well-known hills, and imagines a mournful dirge to be uttered over the subject of his verse by all the places which he was accustomed to frequent :—

‘ Thee wept Angitia's grove, thee Fucinus  
With glassy wave, and every liquid lake  
Gave sighs for thee.’

"He could not have written either more briefly or more pathetically; observe, however, whether all the beauty of the passage does not lie in the places enumerated; unless, perhaps, we include also the sudden and abrupt termination of the sentence in the middle of the verse."—P. 769.

The author proceeds afterwards to show, at length, that names of places, besides the general reality with which they invest a description and bring it home to us, may be further considered as intimately connected with poetry on three separate grounds; first, as recalling the familiar scenes, and with them the associations of childhood; or, secondly, as awakening a peculiar feeling of obscure and dreamy recognition; the poet reverting to places seen by him only once and transiently, with the pleasure of a traveller who goes a second time, after a long interval, over ground which he has previously traversed; or lastly, as supplying a field for the imagination—a remark which applies to the mention of all places with which the writer is personally unacquainted, but which he dwells on, in the same way in which persons will often amuse themselves with a map, by trying to picture to themselves the face of the country and the character of its streams or mountains. In all this interesting

portion of the prælections, which deserve a more detailed notice than we can now afford them, the characteristic practice of the poet is both explained and vindicated.

Finally, before quitting Virgil, let us notice a very interesting point on which Mr. Keble touches, in his remarks on the Platonic character of Virgil's religion, namely, the meaning of the dismissal of Æneas from the infernal regions to the upper world, by the ivory gate, through which the false dreams passed, rather than by the gate of horn which was exclusively appropriated to the true visions. Mr. Keble naturally rejects the interpretation of the old commentators, who regard it as a tacit declaration, on the poet's part, that the whole scheme of a state of future retribution as exhibited in the sixth book of the Æneid, was purely imaginary, and employed only for poetical purposes, like any other pleasing fiction.

"Who can endure," says Mr. Keble, "that so grave a subject should be closed in this manner? Let us rather lay it down, that the narration is treated as a kind of dream, for this reason, because it pertains to that world which is seen not by the eyes but by the mind, mankind having especial intercourse with this world when the mind only is awake, and the senses are asleep. Hence the employment of the 'ivory gate' has much the same meaning as if Virgil had said that Æneas, on waking out of sleep, became aware that this secret world of religious wonders had been exhibited to him in his slumbers; not as though it were fictitious and imaginary, but in compliance with the ordinary law of those things which lie beyond the confines of the visible world, and the perceptions of sense. Further, with regard to the expression '*false dreams*,' I do not suppose him to deny the truth of the things themselves, but to signify that it was only the shadow and semblance of them which was presented to Æneas."—P. 785.

No one, we think, can hesitate to accept Mr. Keble's interpretation, in preference to the one which he explodes; but yet we do not quite see the force or appropriateness of the implication thus conveyed; as it was competent for the poet, from the first, if he had preferred it, to have exhibited the whole scene to Æneas, by a vision presented to him in his sleep, instead of the method which he has actually adopted; and we also seem to feel that, according to this view, it would, on the whole, have been more satisfactory, if he had departed by the horn-gate, rather than the ivory one. We shall venture to suggest another explanation, which, if the theory on which it depends can be substantiated, would not, probably, be objected to by Mr. Keble as inadequate or inappropriate. What, then, if it can be made to appear that Virgil wrote with no express intention of representing an imaginary *subterranean* world, but took for his theatre (much as Homer had done before him) the actual and visible region so long marked out by popular tradition as the kingdom of the dead,—the district, namely, containing the lake,

which still bore the name of Acheron, and that volcanic and sulphureous tract which so naturally suggested the fiery river and other terrors of the realm of Tartarus—and that his object was rather by a kind of illusion skilfully to adapt and interweave the later fiction of a subterranean world, than directly to employ it as his scene of action? If this could be proved, then the subject of the dismissal by the ivory gate would be capable of a natural and consistent explanation to the following effect:—*Æneas* is conducted into this sacred ground, and, under certain conditions, has his eyes opened for awhile, to discern the mysteries of the invisible world which occupies it; but when the object is accomplished for which he was admitted there, the mysterious scene is not, of course, intended to remain permanently visible to him, and accordingly, he is made to pass out at the gate of false dreams, that is, he is now placed under a delusion, or what would be styled a “glamour,” in the language of northern mythology; his eyes are again closed to the realities of things, he discerns nothing more of the invisible world which is around him,\* but traverses, unconsciously, the very scene itself of these wonders, (“*secat iter ad naves*”), and rejoins his companions on the shore of *Cumæ*.

Now Heyne and other commentators on the Sixth Book of the *Æneid*, while taking great pains to fix the sites of the temple of *Apollo*, the lake and cavern of *Avernus*, and even *Acheron* itself, yet invariably adopt the subterranean hypothesis, and furnish, accordingly, some imaginary scheme of an intricate circle of waters, or succession of rivers flowing one into the other, as best satisfying the demands of the poet's geography. An ingenious pamphlet was, however, published some years ago at *Naples*, in which its author attempted to harmonize the description of the poem more completely with the existing features of the country. The ground assigned by him as the scene of *Æneas*' wanderings, is the tract of country extending four or five miles from *Cumæ* southwards, and terminating in *Cape Misenum*.

This region is surrounded on three sides by the *Mediterranean*; and in the days of *Strabo*, when the *Lucrine lake* had been united with *Avernus*, was almost a peninsula, being united to the main land only by the narrow tract of ground lying between *Avernus* and the coast of *Cumæ*. These lakes, together with *Acheron*, which lies by the sea, on the western side of the district above mentioned, and, according to *Strabo*'s account of it, well answers to the modern lake of *Fusaro*, are considered by him as represented in *Virgil* indifferently under the names of *Styx*, *Cocytus*, &c. and constitute the boundary of the *Infernal*

---

\* Compare the manner in which *Homer*'s deities on the field of battle are revealed by a special gift of sight to the most favoured heroes.

Regions. The cavern now existing in the side of the crater-like basin of Avernus, which is usually identified with that described in Virgil\* as the entrance to Tartarus, he states to be occasionally open at its southern extremity, and accordingly conducts the hero and priestess *through* this, downwards towards the Acheron, or Fusaro; which being crossed, they are supposed to leave on their left hand the "Tartarian domains" represented by the volcanic ground in the centre of the district, and finally arrive at the Elysian fields, which are fixed on the sea-coast in the neighbourhood of the port of Misenum, in accordance probably with the Homeric description of them.

The scheme is drawn out with a minuteness of detail which is occasionally ludicrous; but the general notion seems both original and deserving of attention. We will mention briefly some of the chief arguments which occur to us in favour of it.

And first, we might perhaps expect beforehand, from the circumstances of the case, that a writer of Virgil's judgment would adopt this line. The difficulty with which he had to deal was that the kingdom of the shades having been once fixed here from the time of Homer, the whole country became naturally invested in the eyes of men with the religious awe connected with such a tradition; while, on the other hand, increased familiarity with the same region would naturally give that turn to popular belief, which gradually led men to regard the world of spirits as situate beneath the earth rather than upon it. Would not this difficulty be best met by adhering to the actual localities thus revered, yet approaching them by so mysterious an entrance, as should encourage the illusion that a descent had actually been made into a subterranean region? It must be remembered also, that Virgil was resident for a considerable time at Naples, and would naturally haunt and dwell upon this consecrated and mysterious scenery with more than common interest. Again, if we look to facts, they seem to point in a similar direction. Thus Virgil not unfrequently imitates the language of the *Odyssey* on the same subject; but yet where the imitation is most striking, differs from his original, in order to describe more accurately the true features of the country. Thus Homer, relating the difficulties which beset the approach to the realm of shades, says:—

—— "The way is barr'd  
By mighty rivers and by dreadful streams."

Virgil, imitating the passage, alters it thus:—

—— "The way is barr'd  
By forests, and Cocytus gliding round  
With his dark tide encompasses the realm."

---

\* "Scrupes, tuta licu nigro, nemorumque tenebris."

*Æneid.* VI. 238.



Now the forests growing round Avernus are specially remarked by Strabo. Acheron, again, is described by Strabo in almost the same language which Virgil uses. "Tenebrosa palus Acheronte refuso" is the expression of the poet; Ἀχέρουσια λίμνη τῆς θαλάττης ἀναχυσίς τις (τεναγώδης, that of the geographer. And it may be added, on the same subject, that Virgil perpetually employs the term "marsh" or "lake" (palus, stagnum, lacus, &c.) and hardly ever that of "river" in speaking of the Infernal waters.

The same view is confirmed by a reference to the illustrations employed. Thus, at the outset of the journey, Æneas and the Sibyl are compared to travellers passing through forests in dim and uncertain moonlight. The souls round Charon are compared to autumnal leaves and to birds of passage. The dim apparition of Dido is likened by the poet to the moon faintly struggling through a cloud. Or, again, one of the first objects seen on entering is the elm, under the leaves of which the dreams are clustered. Thus all the imagery employed appears to be taken from the actual features of the country; yet is so managed, as to produce in the mind a strange dreamy sense of uncertainty and illusion, like that which, in one of La Motte Fouqué's finest stories, is represented as overtaking his hero, Sintram, on his entrance into the dark valley, "which almost seemed to him as if prepared to be his grave." We leave then our theory of the "ivory gate" to rest on the arguments above stated, in the hope that they will be strong enough to support it.

That which is above praise may fairly claim, it should seem, to be above criticism. We make, therefore, the following concluding remarks, in the way, to use the author's own language, not so much of assertion as investigation. Our feeling is, that the theory stated and applied in these volumes harmonizes perhaps better with the phenomena of ancient than of modern poetry—that there have been, especially in later times, writers, who cannot indeed be said to exhibit any one ruling affection such as would be necessary to give them a place among the great primary poets of Mr. Keble's system—men, who perhaps have undertaken to describe human action, and whose pages are full of false and exaggerated sentiment, or who have depicted nature and scenery in untrue colouring; who, notwithstanding, seem to possess something more than mere *artistical* talent, and may not consequently be thrust down at once into the secondary ranks of versifiers and imitators—men who have not unfrequently written passages which we cannot refuse to call in themselves eminently poetical, however much the authors of them may be deficient in those general notes of truth and consistency which characterize the highest poets. Why, argued Aristotle, if a man is positively happy at any given moment of his life, must we wait till he is dead before we can pronounce him happy?—and so, in some sense,

it might be asked, why, when a man has written that which is poetical, must we wait to examine the whole of his writings before we can pronounce him to be a poet? We lack, in short, a middle place between Mr. Keble's two great divisions of primary and secondary writers; and, if we can make our view intelligible, some reasons may perhaps be assigned why such a place should be conceded.

The birthplace of poetry is of course in that element of our nature, which was called *θυμός* by the Greek moralists, or is represented by the general name of the "heart and affections" among ourselves—and which, under whatever particular manifestation we regard it, whether in the form of love, or even, according to Coleridge, embodied in the scriptural expression "wisdom," always implies a warmth of feeling which carries us beyond ourselves, and is the direct counterpoise to the lower propensities of our nature, to its selfishness and utilitarianism:—

" — Love was given,  
Encouraged, sanctioned, chiefly for this end,  
For this the passion to excess was driven,  
That Self might be annull'd, its bondage prove  
The fetters of a dream, opposed to Love."\*

Further, this feeling, when once awakened, has also its corresponding object, something morally beautiful and excellent, in the attainment of which it rests, and without which it is not satisfied. In Dante's language:—

"Posa sì in esso come fera in lustra,  
Iosto ch'è giunto l'ha, è giunger puollo,  
Se non, ogni disio sarebbe frustra."

On the other hand, it must not be overlooked, that the object may occasionally be such as by its very potency to arouse and call forth feeling otherwise dormant in the mind: it may be one on which we no sooner gaze than we immediately ascend towards it. Hence, all poetry, it would seem, is capable of being contemplated under a two-fold point of view, what we may conveniently call its subjective and objective aspects. It is to the latter of these that we call attention on this occasion. Mr. Keble has confined himself almost exclusively to the former view; the feeling as it exists in the poet's mind is what he looks to; and naturally so; for the object which satisfies it is comparatively unimportant, when the whole question to be determined is simply whether such feeling be genuine or fictitious. Nor, again, in many cases is the object of equal interest to the reader and to the writer of the poem. We admire the Achilles, not because we are ourselves enraptured with the perfections of the heroic ages, but because we see evidently that they were of such surpassing interest to Homer. The prominent feature which attracts us is

---

\* Wordsworth—Laodamia.

all along that restless "fever of the heart" (in Mr. Wordsworth's language) which requires to be "mitigated" by the aid of poetry. But let us now approach poetry from the other side; and what if there shall be objects which, when presented to the mind, command of themselves, and from their own nature, a most universal interest and direct sympathy? Will they not in some sort convert men into poets even in spite of themselves? that is, will they not occasionally produce for the time a true and sufficient inspiration, even in minds not possessing, it may be, that intensity of feeling which seeks to escape in one uniform and decided current? It might perhaps be urged, on the other side, that this would be in fact seeking

—— "from outward forms to win  
The passion and the life whose fountains are within;"

and that, in attributing any inspiring power to the object itself, the truth contained in Coleridge's beautiful lines is overlooked:

—— "We receive but what we give,  
And in our life alone does Nature live;  
Ours is her wedding-garment, ours her shroud,  
And would we aught behold of higher worth  
Than that inanimate cold world allow'd  
To the poor, loveless, ever-anxious crowd,  
Ah! from the Soul itself must issue forth  
The light, the glory, the fair luminous cloud,  
Enveloping the earth,  
And from the Soul itself there must be sent  
A sweet and potent voice of its own birth,  
Of all sweet sounds the life and element."

Our meaning, however, is altogether in the spirit of these lines—that while a certain degree of responsive feeling is, of course, necessary in the mind which contemplates, the object itself may justly be called poetical independently of this feeling, exactly as a thing is really beautiful, though grief or oppression of spirits may for the time prevent our deriving pleasure from the perception of its beauty. And what other can these objects be, which are thus capable of awakening deep feeling, and therefore even of creating poetry, but those Ideas of which all men in some degree acknowledge the influence—namely, the high and abstract ideas, or mysteries, of Perfection, Eternity, Infinity, absolute Tranquillity, and others akin to these?

Let us take Mr. Moore's lines as an example of what we mean:

"And when I watch the line of light that plays  
Along the smooth wave to the burning West,  
I long to tread that sunny path of rays,  
And think 'twill lead to some bright Isle of rest."

Who would deny these lines to exhibit an eminently poetical feeling in the writer, setting apart the consideration whether he be a primary poet, in Mr. Keble's sense of the term? And what do these lines embody but one of these ideas, which, perhaps,

more than any other, engrosses and fills the mind? "Rest," in Hooker's language, being "the end of all motion, and the last perfection of all things that labour. Labours in us are journeys; and, even in them which feel no weariness by any work, yet they are but ways whereby to come unto that which bringeth not happiness till it doth bring rest; for as long as anything which we desire is unattained we rest not." We may refer, also, to one of the most admired of Mr. Tennyson's poems, the *Lotus Eaters*, as an instance of the exhibition of the same idea; where the effect is further heightened by the contrast drawn between the wearisome labours of men,

"Storing yearly little dues of corn, and wine, and oil,"

and the sublime tranquillity of the Epicurean heaven:—

"There they sit and smile in secret, looking down on wasted lands,  
Blight and famine, plague and earthquake, fighting towns and praying hands."

We remember, also, a fine example in the *Lyra Apostolica*, in the lines beginning,—

"They are at rest!  
We may not stir the heaven of their repose  
By rude invoking voice, or prayer addressed  
In waywardness to those,  
Who in the mountain-grots of Eden lie,  
And hear the fourfold river as it murmurs by."

Take, again, an instance of a different idea. One of the finest passages in *Thalaba* is that in which the penitent rebel-angels are introduced:—

"Thus, while he spake, recumbent on the rock  
Their forms grew visible:  
A settled sorrow sat upon their brows;  
Sorrow alone, for trace of guilt and shame  
Now nought remained; and gradual, as by grief,  
The sin was purged away,  
Their robe of glory, purified of stain,  
Resumed the lustre of its native light."

All the grand and highly poetical effect of this passage is evidently traceable to the Idea or Mystery of the Free-will, as witnessed to in the fact that a responsible being is compelled to acquiesce in the justice of inflicted punishment.

Or, if we look to the poetry embodied in the national legends of any country, we find the same ideas distinctly mirrored in them. What else was the remarkable classic legend of the ever-flowing ocean river, with the everlasting lights rising and setting in its waters, but the representation of "life continuous, being unimpaired?" What the modern Irish tale of the towers long buried by the waves, and still occasionally visible beneath them, but a form of representing Eternity? Such traditions, whether originating in accident or fiction, would never have been preserved, if they were not the imperceptible vehicles of a deeper feeling.

In all these instances, then, there is high poetry in a just sense of the word, and to be legitimately accounted for by the fact of their connexion with one or other of those great and prime ideas which are, more or less, engrossing to the minds of all men.

It was observed that this species of poetry was apparently more particularly characteristic of modern times; and so widely does this apply, that perhaps even a third field of poetry might not unreasonably be added to the two already enumerated by Mr. Keble; that, as there has flourished a distinct poetry of *persons*, and afterwards a distinct poetry of *things*, so, lastly, there has also been a distinct poetry of *ideas*; and this last mentioned species would apparently be especially suitable, in its character, to the period of a revealed religion. Mr. Wordsworth has remarked, that, after the gift of Christianity to man,—

"Arts which before had drawn a soft'ning grace  
From shadowy fountains of the Infinite,  
Communed with that Idea face to face."

and the observation seems more immediately applicable to Poetry. It is not meant that this third province was altogether unentered by the classic poets, or that it stands altogether independent of the other two in modern composition, but that the old writers only touched upon it slightly and incidentally in comparison with later authors. And of the way in which this may happen we find very good illustrations in the present lectures; for it has been well shown by Mr. Keble that the poetry of active life occasionally invades the province of inanimate nature, and the reverse; the Homeric writer at times becomes Virgilian, and the Virgilian Homeric; so, in the same manner, that Lucretius, in the midst of his philosophical speculations, has written a lamentation over the miseries of human life in the style of Virgil, while Virgil, again, in those beautiful passages where he refers, on several occasions, to the subjects of physical philosophy, for the time fully enters into the poetry of Lucretius. Exactly in the same way is it that the classic poets in general have touched occasionally on that province which we have distinguished as the poetry of ideas, none perhaps more obviously than Lucretius, though Homer and Virgil have done the same, but less frequently and directly. Virgil, in particular, will furnish us with a good instance both of the fact itself, and of the difference, in this respect, between himself and the modern poets. There is a single line in his fourth Georgic, not noticed by Mr. Keble, but, we think, as full of poetry as a single line can comprise: speaking of the shortness of the lives of bees, Virgil remarks:—

"—Neque enim plus septima ducitur æstas;"

and immediately adds:—

*"At genus immortale manet :—*

*"Scarce seven summers, and their term of days—  
Their line endureth everlastingly."*

The poet evidently dwells with delight on the reflection that what at first sight conveys the notion of nothing but the mutable and the transitory, involves more deeply the idea of everlasting continuance and permanency; the several momentary atoms which pass by in such rapid succession, are found to be the links of a chain old as the heaven and earth itself. Now what else is this idea, so casually glanced at, and so immediately quitted, but the one great idea which lies at the root of the compositions of our modern master-poet, Mr. Wordsworth? An idea of which he himself furnishes the formula in the expression—

*"Central peace subsisting at the heart  
Of endless agitation;"*

and brought out, perhaps, most fully and directly in his Vernal Ode; but traceable in various forms, from one end to the other of his writings.

Thus, how evidently he selects from the shifting scenery of nature all that most completely embodies "that vision of endurance and repose" which he loves to contemplate;—

*"The silence that is in the starry sky,  
The sleep that is among the lonely hills."*

With what pleasure he dwells on Painting, as an art whose province it is more especially to fix and enchain the transient. Here, then, is a poet whom we may call primary in a new province, comparatively unknown to the ancient world, the region of ideas being to him, what the region of humanity was to Homer, or that of nature to Virgil. Moreover, in which of these two other classes could we arrange Mr. Wordsworth's poetry, if we wished to do so? Shall we class him with those who have exquisitely celebrated the glories of the natural world? This he has done undoubtedly; but he is also the poet of humanity in a degree far beyond Virgil or Lucretius; and yet it is remarkable that he by no means possesses that dramatic faculty which is the exclusive inheritance of the Homers and the Shakespeares, whose province is human action. He is "Spectator ab extra," as Coleridge has observed; never sympathizing *with* the characters whom he describes, but feeling always *for* them; a philosophical contemplator of the drama of life, rather than an interested actor in it. What remains, then, but to say that the mysteries of ideas are the especial sources of his inspiration, and consequently the thread of his poetry; that some one of these more immediately fills and occupies his mind, but that his province lies among them all, and that he avails himself indifferently of the world of society and of nature, of mind and of matter, according as these can best supply him



with shadows and reflections of them, even as he himself writes :—

“ I have felt  
A presence that disturbs me with the joy  
Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime  
Of something far more deeply interfused,  
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,  
And the round ocean, and the living air,  
And the blue sky, and in the *mind of man*.”

Two observations may be made in confirmation of the view here taken. It is occasionally said that Mr. Wordsworth's poetry is deficient in that great charm of *indirectness* which distinguishes the classic writers; these latter so generally giving utterance to poetical sentiments without seeming to be conscious that they are doing so. Now, if it be granted, as it probably will be, that this is chiefly the case in those passages of the old writers in which they seem to have stumbled unawares upon some high idea, or mystery, the display complained of in modern poetry must, in some degree, be the natural consequence of these mysteries being made more direct objects of contemplation. The second proof to which we appeal, is the not unfrequent assertion that Mr. Wordsworth's poetry is adapted only to minds of a particular cast, and not capable of being appreciated by a considerable number. Now is not this exactly what might be expected with regard to a writer whose especial province is the region of ideas, rather than things or persons? Those who are altogether deficient in imagination, whose wings, in Platonic language, have irrecoverably dropped off, can never ascend with the writer into the world which is so familiar to him, and consequently will never enter into the spirit of his poetry.

Thus much on the subject of Mr. Wordsworth's compositions, which we have alluded to as principally exemplifying the view which we have here attempted, however unsuccessfully, to delineate. There is a pleasure in concluding with the mention of a writer, to whom Mr. Keble, in the dedication of his volumes, acknowledges himself to be under the deepest obligations from the study of his poetry, and whom he considers, “by ever raising the minds of his readers to high and holy things, and advocating the cause of the poor and simple,”\* to have fulfilled most worthily the mission with which he was entrusted.

---

\* Dedication.

*The Irish Sketch-Book.* By Mr. M. A. TITMARSH. With numerous Engravings on Wood, drawn by the Author. Two vols. post 8vo. London: Chapman and Hall. 1843.

POSSIBLY some of the Graveairs family, a numerous sept, and an unmanageable, because irrational, may be scandalized, if a Review of our serious and dignified character should take up the present work. Indeed, if we chose to keep our own counsel discreetly, we might skilfully veil the fact, that they are from the authorship of one whose fame, we suppose, has not reached Strait-laced Castle, Puritan Place, or Hypocrisy Hall—the principal and ancestral seats of the Graveairs race—we mean the Fat Contributor of *Punch*. But we are violating no confidence—for, to say the truth, we never enjoyed any confidence from Mr. Michael Angelo Titmarsh—when we mention, what the dedication of the present volumes informs us, that the facetious contributor to the famous *Hebdomadal*, which every body reads, when they can get it, and which so few plead guilty to reading, and the “Cockney” author of the *Irish Sketch-Book*, are Mr. W. M. Thackeray, a Cambridge man, and a scholar of some distinction, as well as a very lively, and, we believe, well-intentioned writer. He has been a contributor in various ways, we understand, to the current periodical literature of the day; but in what quarters we are not aware: our personal knowledge of Mr. Thackeray not extending beyond the work which we are noticing, and some most misty and indistinct recollections of laughable cuts, and travelled reminiscences, very etchy and sharp-lined in character, which our few, perhaps happily, perhaps unhappily few, acquaintances with the lively and world-famous *Punch*, have permitted.

Not that we intend to offer an unqualified—or, indeed, any other eulogium—on Mr. Titmarsh’s speculations; with most of his conclusions we are other than satisfied: a good deal of his rollicking, careless, whisky-drinking, car-driving, Rory-O’More, (we are not called upon to be more explicit,) slap-dash manners, seems anything, we fear, but sober and Christian; and were it not that, ever and anon, a thorough gust of genuine feeling and honest right-mindedness convinces us that not a little of this is assumed, we should not have taken up the book at all. But much of the jesting, flippant sarcasm of many writers is a very deep and serious matter: there are few who are competent to do justice to, or to give credit for, it. A high and deep philosophy, as well as a cold cynicism, may be at the bottom of even a reckless Cockney traveller. Mere animal spirits—what is called a sense of the ludicrous—or even the conventional trick of catching loose and thoughtless readers by truth’s hook, baited with jests—such are the ordinary explanations, or it may be apologies, for the Shandy school of writers. But who shall say that

a writer like Erasmus, or among heathen, an Aristophanes, were not pioneers of truth, and witnesses to the stern reality of things? What is ridicule? In a sense, it has been rightly deemed the, or rather a, criterion of the holiest essence, even of truth itself. If poetry be the relief, the natural discharge, of the overburthened sense of an oppressive wrong—or, again, the spontaneous and unsought outbreak of the conscience, and sense of the beautiful and the good, why should it not be that ridicule is, after all, but an expression of the sense of vivid contrast between right and wrong—of pretence and fact? The ludicrous is but a phase of the poetic mind: the highest writers of the ludicrous—and in thus theorizing, we are concerned but with the highest—are themselves often the truest poets. The great comedian of Greece, and among ourselves, such an one as Mr. Thomas Hood, are among the very highest poets. In naming the latter, it is something like a disgrace, and yet a characteristic, of the age, an unreal age, that the author of the noble poem on Eugene Aram has been only regarded as the compiler of *Comic Annuals*. But unless upon some such estimate, how can we account for the fact, that the inventor of the Sausage-seller, is also the writer of the lyric odes in the *Birds* and the *Clouds*? Upon what other principle can we relegate to the same mind the ballad of the *Song of the Shirt*, which does seem to have found a general echo, only, perhaps, because it has been widely quoted, and the ordinary jesting and joking of the same writer in *Bentley's Miscellany*? And, in a kindred art, George Cruikshank is at once not only a ludicrous, but, which seems scarcely so well acknowledged, a deeply pathetic "maker." Here again poetry and a lively perception of the absurd and incongruous meet.

There seem to be but two classes of people who make no allowance for, and hold no sympathy with, ludicrous writing: either the hypocrites, whose life is one long unreality, and who have not the courage to avow their involuntary assent to, and relish of, fun; and as this is a moral fault, we care not to answer their objections to the comic: or, again, those dull but respectable souls, who are intellectually, it may be physically, incapable of appreciating the poetic spirit in any of its developments, and the existence of this latter class helps our argument not a little; for it will be found, as a rule, that the ludicrous is least acceptable among earnest minds—and such only are we now regarding—to those who are in other respects also incapable of the higher influences of poetry in the general. Many, and those very good men, lack the faculty of poetry in art, in music, in architecture, and in poetry in its lower and exclusive sense—and such invariably cannot, as the phrase goes, enter into a joke; it falls dead upon their sensorium, it wakens no echo in the inner man. We have a perfect right, if the induction is fairly conducted, to attribute this latter incapacity to a larger, and

often carefully concealed, perhaps an unconscious, defect; that is, to the total absence of the whole higher intellectual and æsthetic organization. It would, therefore, be but fair, when sincere and candid objections are made to a ludicrous expression, or turn of writing, to examine the objectors a little at depth, and ascertain (the process is easy) whether, in their minds, the same objection, or inappreciation rather, does not also lie against the whole poetic range and cast of thought and feeling.

There can be no question that the γελοῖον in the abstract is anything but the unworthy vehicle which sciolists and owls among us would maintain: it is part of the more perfect human constitution; and the disciples of Bishop Butler, and of experience, ask no more to assign to it *an* office in the great economy of the mind: nor has it been thought unworthy of classification, though the inquiry is lost, by the greatest uninspired philosopher.\* We claim, of course, to be understood, not as vindicating all the mischievous and profane rubbish which passes current under the name of the ludicrous: to distinguish between irony and bomolochy, between satire and buffoonery, we ask not Aristotle's aid; we would be the last to admit the legitimacy of sarcasm in sacred matters; but we contend for it as a principle of truth little understood in philosophy—as, when scientifically analyzed, a development of the poetic faculty—and therefore an instrument to which a province in investigation must be fairly assigned. It may possibly be that Mr. Titmarsh would be the first to laugh at such subtlety and refinement: we may have erred in over-estimating *his*, or anybody's else, employment of ridicule, but we are glad of some opportunity of meeting, however briefly, objections which, often otherwise than capriciously, may possibly have been urged either to what we have ourselves written, or what we have thought it right to read, or even to recommend. May it not be—of course, we only throw out the thought for subsequent investigation—that there was more than is, at first sight, apparent in certain observances and practices of the Church in other ages and countries, which from our habits we are not disposed, and that properly, because of present feelings, education, and habits, to make the slightest allowance for, but rather at once, and in the gross, to condemn? We allude to such things as the Boy-Bishop in England, the Abbot of Unreason, the Feast of Fools, the *Mardi-Gras*, the ludicrous sculptures in wood and stone in churches, the grotesque representations of certain scenes in illuminations, the Mystery

---

\* It is but schoolboy literature to allude to the passage in the Rhetoric, and its reference to a disquisition no longer extant in the Poetic, of Aristotle. We are not aware of any good English treatise on the ludicrous: Hobbes' definition is incomplete, and singularly characteristic of his selfish philosophy; it does not amount to more than the description of a sneer. Scholars say, that something may be found in Proclus's Comment on the *Timæus*. Has anybody but Taylor read it?

Plays, processions, as sometimes conducted, all of which form a vast class, in which there must have been *some* principle involved. These things were not accident; to say that they have been, or are, abused, and gave, or give, rise to much profanity and irreverence, is not an adequate account of the fact of their existence, and of their origin. Nay, more; we are not apologizing for them, still less recommending their revival: perhaps they were false and impolitic applications of some partially understood, or altogether misappropriate, principle; it may be that every one of these things is totally indefensible; but what then? They were not accident; they must have aimed at something, whether they realized and attained it or not. And this something we conceive to have been a desire to recognise, on the part of the Church, all, however various, the common functions of our human constitution, all parts and objects of the heaven-gifted human mind—and, in some measure, to enlist them into the service of, and incorporate them with, the only living truth, the Church: to sanctify them by absorbing them, while marshalling them into her host, to bless and modify them.\*

Nor must it be forgotten, that now and then—we are very far from laying this down as a general rule, inasmuch as counterfeited jesters, like all other mocks and unrealities, are more rare than those who ever and upon principle used the ludicrous in the service of truth—there has existed a strange, and yet a real, though seemingly inconsistent, sense of religion in characters which, though otherwise most in act and consequence irreligious, have been at the same time chief masters in the realms of wit. Swift's is a case which we have in view. It were but simply sinful to offer the slightest defence of this man's abominable filth, and obscenity, and profanity: his is the very dunghill of English literature. It may be that he was all along partially deranged: his conduct, utterly inexplicable, to Stella seems to prove it; for we can hardly attribute it to that religious motive which seems, unhappily, to have influenced some even in very early ages of the Church. (We refer to well-known allusions in *S. Cyprian* and elsewhere.) But with all this man's strange abominations in thought and word and work, he did, and that habitually, the most paradoxically, as it seems, religious things. Johnson, we quote from the common biography in the *Lives of the Poets*, tells us—that he restored the practice of weekly com-

---

\* An instance occurs to us, which may possibly make our meaning clearer: in the beautiful chapel of St. John the Baptist, forming the north aisle of St. Mary's, Guildford, are some fresco-paintings on the ceiling: they are immediately over the spot where the altar stood. Some of them cannot, to our eyes, present other than ludicrous associations. How is this? The artists of the fourteenth century were not the men to suggest laughing for laughing's sake, except upon some great principle: we may not enter into it; we are not called upon to do so; but we must admit the fact, account for it as we can. Cases of indecent representations we desire not to include in what we have said: they are as unintelligible as indefensible.

munion at S. Patrick's—that he was most careful in the duties of his church—that he spent more money on the fabric than all his predecessors—that he attended the daily and early services, then common, in London—that he “read prayers every morning to his servants with such dexterous secrecy that his visitors never knew of it”—in addition to which, it is known that he left all his fortune to charities, and that the scheme of the fifty new churches in London—the Queen Anne's churches—was planned and mainly carried out by Swift. Of course it is the fashion, in certain quarters, now to say that these are all infallible marks of the beast—no surer sign of an irreligious man than frequent prayers and communion, and munificent church building, we now are assured. But what *we* have to account for is the existence of this practical sense of religion—and we had rather be heathen men than to hint that all this is other than true religion—with a keen sense of the ludicrous. The turning point of Swift's character was contempt and hatred of hypocrisy and shame; and this feeling, so intense, that it made him ambitious to be thought,\* and in the end, of course, made him worse than he was: this feeling led him to exaggerate the faults and wickednesses, the follies and failings of his kind; hence he was a satirist and a humourist; *i. e.* he fulfilled the conditions of one who must excel in what in the outset we defined the ludicrous, when we said that ridicule of a legitimate kind is but a deep sense of the opposition between right and wrong, truth and hypocrisy.

Swift saw that all these “works” were true things, solid, real things, no shadows and phantoms and make-believes these prayers, and sacraments, and churches, and alms,—therefore he did them; he saw, moreover, that there was much unreality and conventionalism and pretence in the world: therefore he did alms and said prayers habitually in secret; he made no parade of his religion; he abhorred and despised cant and pretence: therefore he was the very first among humorous writers; only he, unhappily, carried his sense of the ridiculous so far, as to permit it to overwhelm decency, good sense, and even reverence.

Thus much has been drawn from us by the present writer's connexion with *Punch*; and if, which probably is not the case, he is in want of a vindication of his manner, we own that it is mainly intended for quarters nearer home than his publishers'. The *Irish Sketch-Book* is sufficiently described by its name; a work pretending neither to accuracy nor arrangement; but lively, striking, and sufficiently like the original at least to recall general impressions, and abounding rather in vigorous and decided strokes, what are called happy hits, than remarkable

\* “The suspicions of his irreligion proceeded in a great measure from his dread of hypocrisy;—instead of wishing to seem better, he delighted in seeming worse than he was.”—*Johnson*.



as a finished picture. We are not reconciled to, perhaps because we do not altogether understand, the *sobriquet* which Mr. Thackeray has thought proper to adopt; it hints, probably, at a Raffaaesque Cockneyism, ideas sufficiently incongruous to be at least diverting,—indeed, unexpected and contradictory combinations are somewhat the staple of modern witticism,—we therefore discard Titmarsh, and proceed to remark, that as Mr. Thackeray seems to belong to no party, or, as it might be, perhaps, more correctly stated, as he does not seem to be furnished with any very guiding and influential principles, his facts and comments are now and then strikingly original, and they may help others to frame plans and schemes upon. Indeed, we are ourselves somewhat of the sentiments, rarely expressed, which conclude the book:—

“To have ‘an opinion about Ireland,’ one must begin by getting the truth; and where is it to be had in the country? or rather, there are two truths, the Catholic truth and the Protestant truth. The two parties do not see things with the same eyes. I recollect, for instance, a Catholic gentleman telling me that the Primate had forty-three thousand *five hundred* a-year: a Protestant clergyman gave me chapter and verse, the history of a shameful perjury and malversation of money on the part of a Catholic priest; nor was one tale more true than the other. But *belief is made a party business*; and the receiving of the Archbishop’s income would probably not convince the Catholic, any more than the clearest evidence to the contrary altered the Protestant’s opinion. Ask about an estate, you may be sure almost that people will make mistakes, or volunteer them if not asked. Ask a cottager about his rent, or his landlord; you cannot trust him. I shall never forget the glee with which a gentleman in Munster told me how he had sent ‘off MM. Tocqueville and Beaumont, with *such* a set of stories.’ Inglis was seized, as I am told, and mystified in the same way. In the midst of all these truths, attested with—‘I give ye my sacred honour and word,’ which is the stranger to select? And how are we to trust philosophers who make theories upon such data?”—Vol. ii. pp. 325, 326.

We trust that Mr. Thackeray has acted upon this cautious line: we believe that he has; for we find him rather profuse in what he has seen, than what he has heard. The peculiarity of the Irish to which he alludes is of course nothing more than the result of a warm and creative imagination; embarrassing enough to sober plodding minds, like our own, who desire to get at truth, but a habit of mind anything but uncommon. Those who indulge in it cannot be persuaded that it is lying; they live so abstractedly in the world of ideas, that their own imaginations become concrete, as it were, and the noumenal world becomes phenomenal to them. They are dangerous to quote after, for the world does not give much credit to super-sensual metaphysics; but the habit becomes so infelicitously ingrained, that, we trust,

somehow the responsibility becomes diminished. One or two of the greatest liars we know seem happily unconscious of the vigour and felicity of their inventive powers. How far it may be so with the Irish we cannot say. But in exchange for our sermon, here is one of Mr. T.'s, a Sermon on Sermons he calls it. Scene—Westport, County Mayo.

“The sermon at the Established Church was extempore, *as usual*, according to the prevailing taste here. The preacher, by putting aside his sermon-book, may gain in warmth, which we don't want, but lose in reason, which we do. If I were Defender of the Faith, I would issue an order to all priests and deacons to take to the book again; weighing well, before they uttered it, every word they proposed to say upon so great a subject as religion; and mistrusting that dangerous facility given by active jaws and a hot imagination. Reverend divines have adopted this habit, and keep us for an hour listening to what might well be told in ten minutes. They are wondrously fluent, considering all things; and though I have heard many a sentence begun whereof the speaker evidently did not know the conclusion, yet, somehow or other, he has always managed to get through the paragraph without any hiatus, *except perhaps in the sense*. And, as far as I can remark, it is not calm, plain, downright preachers who pursue the extemporaneous system for the most part, but pompous orators, indulging in all the cheap graces of rhetoric—exaggerating words and feelings to make effect, and dealing in pious caricature. Church-goers become excited by this loud talk and captivating manner, and can't go back afterwards to a sober discourse, read out of a grave old sermon-book; appealing to the reason and gentle feelings, instead of to the passions and the imagination. Beware of too much talk, O parsons! *If a man is to give account of every idle word he utters*, for what a number of such loud nothings, windy, emphatic tropes and metaphors, spoken not for God's glory but the preacher's, will many a cushion-thumper have to answer!”—Vol. ii. pp. 95, 96.

Now, though we own that we abhor the nonsense which Mr. Thackeray thinks proper to write elsewhere, about spending what he calls a “shining Sabbath morning,” whatever that may be, in a Wicklow ravine, with “birds for choristers, the river by way of organ, and stones enough to make a whole library of sermons,”—(Ibid. p. 147,)—yet, while we acknowledge that he seems to have gone to church pretty regularly, in the way of book-business perhaps, he seems to have received ample provocation in his experience of extempore preaching.

“Mr. G.'s church (though there would be no harm in mentioning the gentleman's name, for a more conscientious and excellent man, as it is said, cannot be) is close to the Custom-house in Dublin, and crowded morning and evening with his admirers. The service was beautifully read——Then came the sermon: and what more can be said of it, than that it was extempore, and lasted for an hour and twenty minutes? The orator never failed once for a word, so amazing is his

practice; though, as a stranger to this kind of exercise, I could not help trembling for the performer, as one has for Madame Saqui on the slack-rope, in the midst of a blaze of rockets and squibs, expecting every minute she must go over. But the artist was too skilled for that; and after some tremendous bound of a metaphor, in the midst of which you expect he must tumble, neck and heels, and be engulfed in the dark abyss of nonsense, down he was sure to come, in a most graceful attitude too, in the midst of a flattering 'ah,' from a thousand wondering people.

"But I declare solemnly, that when I came to try and recollect of what the exhibition consisted, and give an account of the sermon at dinner that evening, it was quite impossible to remember a word of it; although, to do the orator justice, he repeated a many of his opinions a great number of times over. Thus, if he had to discourse of death to us, it was,—At the approach of the Dark Angel of the Grave—at the coming of the Grim King of Terrors—at the warning of that awful Power, to whom all of us must bow down—at the summons of that Pallid Spectre, whose equal sceptre knocks at the monarch's tower or the poor man's cabin,—and so forth. There is an examiner of plays, and indeed there ought to be an examiner of sermons, by which audiences are to be fully as much injured or misguided as by the other named exhibitions. What call have reverend gentlemen to repeat their dicta half-a-dozen times over, like Sir Robert Peel, when he says anything that he fancies to be witty?

"And it need not be said here that a church is not a sermon-house—that it is devoted to a purpose much more lofty and sacred, for which has been set apart the noblest service, every single word of which latter has been previously weighed with the most scrupulous and thoughtful reverence. And after this sublime work of genius, learning and piety is concluded, is it not a shame that a man should mount a desk who has not taken the trouble to arrange his words beforehand, and speak there his crude opinions in his doubtful grammar? It will be answered that the extempore preacher does not deliver crude opinions, but that he arranges his discourse beforehand; to all which it may be answered, that Mr. — contradicted himself more than once in the course of the above oration, and repeated himself a half-dozen of times. A man in that place has no right to say a word too much or too little.

"And it comes to this,—it is the preacher the people follow, not the prayers, or why is this church more frequented than any other? It is that warm emphasis, and word-mouthing, and vulgar imagery, and glib rotundity of phrase, which brings them together, and keeps them happy and breathless. Some of this class call the Cathedral service Popish—downright scarlet—they won't go to it. They will have none but their own hymns,\* no ornaments but those of their own

\* Of these Irish Protestant hymns, Mr. Thackeray quotes the following:—

"Hasten to some distant isle,  
In the bottom of the deep,  
Where the skies for ever smile,  
And the blacks for ever weep!"

which he is acrimonious enough to stigmatize, (vol. ii. p. 149.) as "nonsensical, false twaddle."

minister, his rank incense and tawdry rhetoric. Coming out of this church, on the Custom House steps hard by, there was a fellow with a bald large forehead, a new black coat, a little Bible, spouting—spouting ‘in omne volubilis ævum,’—the very counterpart of the reverend gentleman hard by. *It was just the same thing*, just as well done, the eloquence quite as easy and round, the amplifications as ready, the big words rolling round the tongue, just as within doors. But we are out of the Wicklow glen by this time; and, perhaps, instead of delivering a sermon there, we had better have been at church hearing one.”—Vol. ii. pp. 149—152.

True words these, Michael Angelo Titmarsh! and, as you are a Cockney, were you ever at —? But in consideration of certain proprietary chapels, upon which we are reckoned severe, we preserve the aposiopesis. These *are* the faults of extempore preaching, as we have ever heard it; but we should be loth to say that a practice stamped with the authority, both of antiquity and, as it seems, of every branch of the Church but our own, were in itself other than, in principle, defensible. But our practice of preaching written sermons has, under past and present circumstances, been of incalculable good for one reason. With the very imperfect theological training which our clergy have had, and in the total absence of a received and uniform body of doctrine among us in the way of oral and traditionary teaching, bad as things are, they would have been tenfold worse had our ten thousand clergy been encouraged, week after week, to have recourse to the perilous stores of their own extemporaneous ignorance. It is only when a Church, like that of the Continent, passes her teachers through a course of dogmatic theology, and has one definite and accredited system upon which to draw, that she can afford to allow the clergy to preach extempore sermons. When, nearer home, we have, as a Church, settled what the fundamental doctrines of the faith are, we may begin to permit some license to our clergy; but till we have agreed whether we are Lutherans or Catholics, or, in other words, not before we have made a truth of what at present exists only as a phrase, —*ex. grat.* that favourite one, the doctrine of the Church of England, —*i. e.* till we have got a *doctrine*—we may as well tie up, as much as may be, our pulpit oratory. Extempore preaching among us is what it is, not because oratory is out of place in a church, but because our pulpit-talkers, though they may be very good men, have really nothing, which being real they have realized, to talk about. Most of them being of that unhappy school which resolves religion into impressions, dreams, shadows, and feelings, miscalled Faith, it is small wonder that their sermons are of the same impalpable and shadowy character. *Enihilo nihil.* To paint clouds and mists you must use very thin and washy colours. But we may as well see whether Mr. Thackeray has sketched the Irish Church Establishment from any other

point of view: here is a snatch from an odd easel, the box of a carriage:—

“The coachman — dealt some rude cuts with his whip regarding the Protestants. Coachman as he was, the fellow’s remarks seem to be correct; for it appears that the religious world of Cork is of so excessively enlightened a kind that one church will not content one pious person; but that, on the contrary, they will be at church of a morning, at Independent church of an afternoon, at a Darbyite congregation of an evening, and so on, gathering excitement *on* information from all sources by which they may come at it. Are not some of the ultra-serious as eager after a new preacher, as the ultra-worldly after a new dancer? don’t they talk and gossip about him as much?” Vol. i. p. 121.

The Vicar of Dundalk is the great protestant hero of Mr. Thackeray, and a very respectable, though by no means remarkable, gentleman he seems to be. Indeed, by the stricken wonderment which the sketcher exhibits at such common things as an infant school, we suspect that parish matters have not fallen much in his way: he actually grows pathetic (vol. ii. p. 191) at hearing that most detestable and offensive canticle, “Will not that be joyful, joyful?” which, for some reason or other, has not yet been banished from similar establishments in England. But the crowning praise is reserved for one whose fine presence is something never to be forgotten, and in this case we quite agree with our author:—

“The primate of Armagh, with his blue riband and badge, looks like a noble Prince of the Church; and I had heard enough of his magnificent charity and kindness to look with reverence at his lofty handsome features.”—Vol. ii. p. 216.

The following *σκητιον* of Protestant ascendancy in Armagh is graphic:—

“Strolling round the town after service, I saw more decided signs that Protestantism was then in the ascendant. I saw no less than three different ladies *on the prow*, dropping religious tracts at various doors.”—Ibid. p. 217.

But, for the sake of fair play, and “equal justice,” as we are concerned with Ireland, we must give Mr. Thackeray’s comments on the external aspect of the other Catholic body in the sister kingdom. Speaking of a chapel in Waterford, he remarks:—

“But a much finer ornament to the church than any of the questionable gewgaws which adorned the ceiling, was the piety, stern, simple, and unaffected, of the people within. *Their whole soul seemed to be in their prayers, as rich and poor knelt indifferently on the flags.*”—Vol. i. p. 83.

The same awful reality of worship he finds at Tralee.

"It was the feast of the Assumption—the chapel and large court leading to it were thronged with worshippers, such as one never sees in our country. Here, in the court-yard, there were thousands of them on their knees, rosary in hand, for the most part praying—in the chapel the crowd was enormous; the priest and his people were kneeling and bowing, and chanting and censer-rattling.—But we who wonder at crosses and candlesticks, see nothing strange in surplices and beadles.\*—Whether right or wrong in point of ceremony, it was evident the heart of devotion was there; the immense dense crowd seasawed and swayed, and you heard a hum of all sorts of wild ejaculations, *each man praying seemingly for himself*, while the service went on at the altar. The altar candles flickered red, &c.—The people as they entered aspersed themselves, making a curtsey and a prayer at the same time. 'A pretty prayer, truly,' says the parson's wife. 'What sad, sad benighted superstition,' says the independent minister's lady. Ah! ladies, great as your intelligence is, yet think, when compared with the Supreme One, what a little difference there is, after all, between your husband's very best extempore oration and the poor Popish creatures!' Let us read the story of the woman and the pot of ointment, that most noble and charming of histories, which equalizes the great and the small, the wise and the poor in spirit, and shows that their merit before Heaven lies in *doing their best*."—Vol. i. pp. 241—245.

From such passages as the following, it might, though, as we shall show, very incorrectly, be thought that Mr. Thackeray is a partisan:—

"I went into the chapel not without awe (I always feel a sort of tremor on going into a Catholic place of worship: the candles, and altars, and mysteries, the priest and his robes, and nasal chanting, and wonderful genuflexions will *frighten* me as long as I live.) The chapel-yard was filled with men and women: a couple of shabby beadles were at the gate, with copper shovels to collect money, and inside the chapel were four or five hundred people *on their knees*."—Vol. i. p. 171.

"I could not help looking at the slim, gentle nun [at the Ursuline Convent of Cork], with her kind smiling face, *with a little tremble*. I'm *afraid* of such—I don't care to own—in their black mysterious robes and awful veils. As priests in gorgeous vestments, and little rosy incense-boys kneel before altars, or clatter silver pots full of smoking odours, I feel I don't know what *sort of thrill and secret creeping terror*."—Ibid. p. 124.

\* Mr. Titmarsh Thackeray is, in this matter, a most accurate observer; in our time we have seen much of what is called "mummery" in churches; but of all the offensive and disgusting pride and creature-worship which can be conceived, is that which is exhibited in certain London churches, where a conceited lecturer is ushered out of the vestry, where he has been drinking sherry and water during the whole of the prayers, preceded by two beadles in laced coats, with crimson waistcoats and silver maces, who draw up on each side of the pulpit stairs bowing to the preacher, while another official follows in his train to—close the pulpit door! The sermon which follows being a severe condemnation of fasting and good works.



Yes! it is even so: the spiritual world, and its marvellous ceremonial, does strike even the careless gazer, the professional tourist, with a "sort of thrill and secret creeping terror;" we are far from thinking that Mr. Thackeray is not a truth-loving man, but his is not habitually, as it would seem, a religious, assuredly not a self-denying character; and yet he quails before the inner might and majesty of religion, he trembles before the gentle nun; he knows that this is religion, this *the* Christian life, and he takes off his shoes, as is fitting, on holy ground; though he ventures—which is all but childish in him to hint—that this smiling blessedness was simulated only to take him in—him, the Cockney traveller, even Mr. Michael Angelo Titmarsh—yet the very wildness and absurdity of the thought proves how hardly he must have been pushed to account for

"the smile with which the nun's face was lighted up whenever she spoke. *She seemed perfectly radiant with happiness*, tripping lightly before us, and distributing kind compliments to each, which made us in a very few minutes forget the introductory fright which her poor little presence had occasioned."—*Ibid.* p. 125.

These are the *realities* of religion which we cannot escape: not but that Mr. Thackeray, as is natural, does his best, but in vain, to escape them by feeling, or pretending to feel (when he is not ashamed to hint that the poor Ursulines are only making believe in their happy faces, he has no right to complain if we suggest occasional doubts about his own sincerity) that profession and vows are—save the mark!—"cursed Paganism!" (p. 130) and "Sutteeism" (p. 132); and elsewhere (p. 91) he is at once facetious and incorrect, by describing the Trappist community at Mount Meillerie as a "grovelling place" of "reverend amateurs in tilling," "ghostly tailors and shoemakers," "spiritual gardeners and bakers, working in silence;" whereas the society is a lay one;\* and he himself acknowledges that "they have cultivated a barren mountain most successfully." He is equally severe and ignorant about the stations at Croagh-Patrick, (vol. ii. pp. 99, 102,) though, as the information was taken at second-hand, we are not called upon to examine it.

We find other incidental testimonies to the reality of the Romish system, from which we ought, and if we please we may, learn much; and if it be so in Ireland, with a body of Clergy, we believe the most ignorant, and in some respects degraded, in

---

\* We suspect a similar, though less important, inaccuracy at vol. ii. p. 76, where Mr. T. speaks of "a sort of lay-convent, being a community of brothers of the third order of St. Francis. They are all artisans and workmen, taking no vows, but living together in common, and undergoing a certain religious regimen. Their work is said to be very good, and all are employed upon some labour or other." We fancy that this order has vows, though not of the *most* rigid character: it is a brotherhood which it might very well suit us to naturalize.

the world, what might not *such* instruments, if incorporated into our system, do among ourselves?

"Here let it be said, that with all this laughing, romping, and the like, there are no more innocent girls in the world than the Irish girls; and that the women of our squeamish country are far more liable to err. One has but to walk through an English and Irish town, and see how much superior is the morality of the latter. That great terror-striker, THE CONFESSORIAL, is before the Irish girl, and, sooner or later, her sins must be told there."—Vol. i. p. 224.

"The lower classes are not a whit the less pleasing. In the midst of their gaiety, it must be remembered that they are the chastest of women."—Ibid. p. 112.

"Amongst the potatoes, and the boys digging them, I observed a number of girls taking them up as dug, and removing the soil from the roots. Such a society for seventy young men, would, in any other country in the world, be not a little dangerous; but Mr. Campbell, the director of the institution [the Agricultural Seminary at Templemoyle] said that no instance of harm had ever occurred in consequence; and I believe his statement may be fully relied on: the whole country bears testimony to their noble purity of morals. Is there any other in Europe which in this point can compare with it?"—Vol. ii. p. 286.

"We take these passages as we find them. Our author seems to have no bias: he states distinctly that the clergy of both communions, for the most part, are earnest men.

"The Protestant clergy—rich, charitable, pious, well-educated, to be found in every parish in Ireland—as pious, more polished, and better educated than their neighbours, the priests, no doubt of it."—Vol. i. pp. 101, 102.

Even the Evangelicalism of Ireland is of a stern, active, practical, living sort, very different from the English sentimentalism and fine lady airs which affect the name among ourselves.

And, elsewhere, alluding to a young Romanist priest at Bunowen, he speaks of "honouring these missionaries, the virtues they silently practise, and the doctrines they preach," (vol. ii. p. 60;) and the result of it all seems to us to be this:—

1. That the Irish are an intensely religious people: the Presbyterians in the North, the Catholics of the South, the fierce Protestants of Derry, the Methodists of Belfast, even the fanatics of Achill—all are in earnest; there is little or no hypocrisy in them: the rival communions hate and detest each other with a bitterness which, whatever else it proves, argues sincerity of some sort: in the County Meath our author fell in with "some thorough Protestant doctrine; the shepherd, being of a loquacious sort, properly belaboured the Popish superstitions for the space of an hour and twenty minutes." (Vol. ii. p. 171.) Whether this period was the average of the Protestant harangues with which Mr. T. was inflicted, or whether it is only synonymous with the Homeric

μῦθοι, in either case we are inclined to sympathize more than we choose to own; and, as though to balance the panniers—to give the equal lump of butter and stone—we find that, on the consecration of “the Bishop of Aureliopolis,” the Romanist preacher, Dr. Miley, who, within a few days, has made himself not a little remarkable by preaching the congratulatory sermon to O’Connell,\* “gives a blow, *en passant*, at the Established Church, whereof the revenues, he elegantly says, ‘might excite the zeal of Dives or Epicurus to become a bishop.’” (Vol. i. p. 16.) There can be no question then of the existence of a deep religious feeling in *all* classes of the Irish: at church, chapel, and meeting-house, the priest and the Bible-reader alike, all mean what they say, and say what they mean. Here then is one vast element of good.

2. Another valuable constituent of the Irish character is a generous devotion to rank and authority; and this displayed, not only “in a dutiful and religious submission to all governors, teachers, spiritual pastors, and masters,” but “in a lowly and reverent ordering to all their betters.” It is superfluous to cite instances of this excellence, but it will be enough to refer to vol. i. p. 110, *ibid.* p. 271, vol. ii. pp. 111, 112. We do not say that this is not carried to excess in a country which has been compelled to invent the term “blarney.” Hence it is that popular leaders have had so much influence in Ireland; a remark so obvious that it seems needless.

3. And that the people are generous, their characteristic vices prove: even their idleness, love of loitering, extravagance, and carelessness, are but a noble nature uncultivated,—the garden flowers degenerating.

In a word, the Irish character has in it the traces, and, we trust, the elements, though deteriorated, of the very highest Christian virtues; religious zeal and awe, submission to spiritual power, chivalrous affection and loyalty, and an unselfish temper. The true spirit of faith,† which counts not the cost, but makes honest and needful ventures for Christ’s sake and for the truth; chastity in the female sex; and a merry and contented spirit which no ill-usage and no misery has yet obliterated—could we look for a more engaging picture, or for materials more hopeful upon which to work? It is what we have read or dreamed of England—merry England

\* This phrase looks awkward; but strange things must be expressed in strange, if so they are but characteristic, words.

† “Most of the Roman Catholic churches that I have seen have been built in this way,—begun when money enough was levied for concluding the foundation, elevated by degrees as fresh subscriptions came in, and finished—by the way, I don’t think I have seen one finished;—but there is something noble in the spirit (however certain economists may cavil at it) that leads people to commence these pious undertakings with the firm trust that ‘Heaven will provide.’”—Vol. ii. p. 272. Nor is this good spirit confined to the Roman communion; an instance quite as affecting is given, with reference to the Church of the Establishment at Portrush, in the previous page.

—the England of saints—the England of a noble peasantry, a loyal commonalty, a religious gentry—before the commercial and economical spirit had eaten the heart out of our national character. But Ireland is a miserable country—its poverty is something incredible—its resources are almost judicially either wasted or neglected—its very virtues seem fading into their reciprocal vices—its religion into blind ignorance or wild fanaticism—its generosity into swinish filth and imbecility—its affectionate temper into cringing servility—its courage into vapouring—its faith into sloth—its remarkable honesty into lying mendicancy. And why is this? Because the Church has yet to fulfil its mission. It will not be the mere reduction of absenteeism—it will not be the formation of a middle class—not the encouragement of manufactures (God forbid *this*, if it be meant to make Ireland another England)—not improved poor laws—not the change of tenure—not the Shannon navigation—not the confiscations of Church property and the annihilation of tithes, which will cure Ireland's woes: there may be, and of course there are, abuses in every one of these items; but it must be by a thorough Church reform that Ireland is to be regenerated. With the following exposure of the proposed political cure of Ireland we are quite satisfied:—

“Are we to suppose, with the Repealers, that the cause of all this degradation and misery is the intolerable tyranny of the sister country, and the pain which poor Ireland has been made to endure? This is very well at the Corn Exchange, and among patriots after dinner; but, after all, granting the grievance of the franchise, (though it may not be unfair to presume that a man who has not strength of mind enough to mend his own breeches or his own windows, will always be the tool of one party or another,) there is no Inquisition set up in the country; the law tries to defend the people, as much as they will allow; the odious tithe has even been whisked off from their shoulders to the landlord's; they may live pretty much as they like. Is it not too monstrous to howl about English tyranny and suffering Ireland, and call for a St. Stephen's-Green Parliament, to make the country quiet and the people industrious? The people are not politically worse than their neighbours in England. The priests and the landlords, if they chose to cooperate, might do more for the country now than any kings or laws could. What you want here, is not a Catholic or Protestant party, but an Irish party.”—Vol. ii. p. 114.

When Mr. Thackeray says, “that the Protestant of the North is as much priest-ridden as the Catholic of the South; priest and old woman-ridden, for there are certain expounders of doctrine in our Church, who are not, I believe, to be found in the Church of Rome,” (vol. ii. p. 266); if he means that this sacerdotal equitation is the cause of the misery of Ireland, because priestly influence is essentially and in all cases bad, of course we differ from him *toto cælo*, because proper priest-riding is the only hope for Ireland, or for any other country. This,

however, the tenor of his book shows not to be his meaning; but if he wishes to convey the impression that the present religious system of Ireland, both in its so-called Protestant, and so-called Catholic [we wish to avoid circumlocution] developments are equally bad, and equally require a thorough change, we thank him most heartily for hinting this; and did the *Irish Sketch-Book* contain no other truth—and we believe that it contains many—we should thank the Cockney, trifler as he may seem, for his honesty.

It may be thought that we have gone out of our way to praise the Irish priests, and to disparage the Established Church; such has not been our object; we have only sought to do simple justice. Mr. Thackeray is for certain the most unprejudiced Irish tourist with whom we have ever met: he writes to serve nobody; he is neither Orangeman nor Repealer,—at least, not that we know of; for his book is, in one sense, quite a phenomenon; there is not the slightest hint of political bearing in the whole two volumes; therefore we have taken his facts. In certain matters we are at direct issue with him: such as his vehement admiration of the Government education scheme, (vol. i. 101 and 104)—his modified adherence to the New Poor Law system—and his trash about public education in England: therefore, when the present writer has borne testimony to the practical fruits of some part of the Romish system, such as the Confessional, and to its effects, as in the *reality* of worship among them, we have at once admitted him as a good and truth-speaking witness. These things are good—they are the Church's work—whether *we* do them or not, let us not be so wicked as to say that prayers and confession, chastity and reverence, can be other than the very divinest gifts of God's Holy Spirit, wherever they exist. So, again, of the practical defects of the Established Communion in Ireland: we know exactly what they are, from long and bitter English experience; and Mr. Thackeray has found them out, and knows that they do harm, and tells us so, and we believe him, and quote his testimony. If any of our readers happen to believe that the *de facto* Anglicanism, or Protestantism, or whatever it is to be called, of the Achill Mission and the O'Sullivans, &c. is perfection, and the *de facto* Romanism of Bishop Doyle is Antichrist, we are not called upon to argue with him. But to our own mind this seems to be at the root of Ireland's misery,—that its clergy, both Romish and English, have exaggerated, to an inconceivable extent, the inherent vices of their respective systems: when both communions unlearn their fearful errors, both in practice and doctrine, it will be time enough to begin to think which party must yield, or rather, that time will for ever have passed away; for the two will have coalesced, and Ireland will be, what she has never been for some centuries, Catholic.

Has it been thought that we, or the author upon whom we have commented, believe the Romanism of Ireland to be other than full of faults? The state of Maynooth physically is but an index of some more important wrong than dirt:—

“Of the Catholic College of Maynooth I must speak briefly, for the reason that an accurate description of that establishment would be of necessity so disagreeable, that it is best to pass it over in a few words. An Irish union-house is a palace to it. Ruin so heedless, filth so disgusting, such a look of lazy squalor, no Englishman who has not seen can conceive. Lecture-room and dining-room, kitchen and students’ room, were all the same. Let the next Maynooth grant include a few shillings’ worth of whitewash, and a few hundred-weights of soap; and if to this were added a half-score of drill-serjeants, to see that the students appear clean at lecture, to teach them to keep their *heads up, and to look people in the face*, Parliament will introduce some cheap reforms into the seminary, which were never needed more than here. Why should the place be so shamefully ruinous and foully dirty? Why should a stranger, after a week’s stay, be able to discover a priest by the scowl on his face, and his doubtful, downcast manner? Is it a point of discipline that his reverence should be made to look as ill-humoured as possible?”—Vol. ii. p. 308.

“They (some students going to Maynooth) were simple, kind-hearted young men, sons of farmers or tradesmen, seemingly; and, as is always the case here, except among some of the gentry, very gentlemanlike and pleasing in manners. — Wait for awhile; and with the happy system pursued within the walls of their college, these smiling, good-humoured faces will come out with a scowl, and downcast eyes, that seem afraid to look the world in the face. — Tomorrow they will begin their work upon that poor freshman; cramping his mind, and biting his tongue, and fining and cutting at his heart.”—*Ibid.* p. 124.

Though some of this is exaggerated, and some meaningless, we are much afraid that the main curse of Ireland, on one side, is the education of the priests. To talk of putting down Romanism by Exeter-Hall crusades, and Irish Societies, and Bible meetings, is, of course, only fit rhodomontade for ladies, young and old, and secretaries and collectors of the various semi-religious bodies who make a trade in Irish grievances. If, then, there must be Romanism, why should not the priests be properly taught? Why should they be encouraged to prostitute their priestly authority as they do? Their flocks do not respect them—they only fear them. The priests do not rule upon the principle of spiritual authority, but rather, they have debased this, by encouraging a belief in a kind of magic and sorcery residing in their office. The priest is regarded rather as a sort of potent, and often malignant, wizard, than as one invested with the powers and consolations of Heaven. The simple,



trustful, religious temper of the peasant is imposed upon: the spiritual censures of the Church are administered literally by the priest's cart-whip flogging up defaulters in their stated offerings: the awful sentence of anathema and excommunication are lowered and made venal either for political or personal partisanship: the altar is turned into the Repealer's tribune; and all because the priests are poor, ignorant, miserably taught, miserably supported, and miserably governed.

And so of the Irish Church: aware of this system of abuses, she has met it with the Charybdis of Protestantism. She has never claimed any spiritual powers: to meet the errors of such a deflection of the sacerdotal principle as we have hinted at, she has hauled down *all* ecclesiastical authority, and has lowered and debased the sacred and hidden Sacramental Powers and Gifts: in a word, she has all but committed herself to Puritanism and Dissent. The Church of Ireland is but the shadow of a Church: with even less independence than our own, subjected, in times past, to the most scandalous Erastianism and Simoniacal jobbing of every sort, she has foregone almost every one of her unearthly functions. We hope that there is some improvement: the fact of the institution of St. Columba's College, (with the details of the place we are but slightly acquainted, and therefore we do not desire to commit ourselves by an unqualified approval of an institution which we do not thoroughly understand) must go for something: surely it is a step in the right direction. In Church and State alike present circumstances seem to show that our business with Ireland is, not so much to remodel,—not so much, however satisfied we may be with other types, at once to attempt to conform our condition to them by a sudden and violent effort,—an effort which must be attended by all sorts of new and foreign institutions, with which we at present have neither the power of association nor of habit; but rather, if God should permit it, to draw out the hidden, yet real, power of institutions and sacred forms, and to appeal to the traditions which, however cramped and mutilated, are preserved to us—to show the strength, though secret, and life, though suspended, which lies beneath, and once informed, our present paralyzed system,—to prove that, though we have an Establishment, it aims, and has aimed, at being the Heavenly Jerusalem, the earthly Zion,—that though we have Sir Robert Peel and an Ecclesiastical Commission, we have also, however torpid, the Convocation of the Church, and the English Monarchy,—that, in spite of the Royal Nomination, we have not lost the Capitular Election of Bishops,—that with Tithe Commutation Acts at work, the sanctity of offerings is only smothered perhaps, but not breathless,—that parishes remain even while union work-houses spot the land like red brick fever-patches,—that the clergy teach, even though it be through the cramped and miserably-

deficient "national system,"—that the Canon-law survives, even under Dr. Lushington and Sir Herbert Jenner Fust,—that we have Christian universities, in spite of resident governors and Hebdomadal Boards. What we have to do, then, is to construct; and that, as times go, with all that is good for anything in existing facts, steadily to transform, infuse, animate, superadd. We shall gain but little by a chaos, with a contingent regeneration. Once, and once only, in the world's history, was there a deluge, and a new earth; but fire and water, electric fluids and ocean tides, the steady gulf-stream, the coral reef and the encroaching, swallowing surge, the moving glacier and avalanche, are energies a thousand times more influential, because less apparent, and because always sweeping in one direction,—these are the forces by which the annals of creation, the permanent conquests of nature, are made. Cataclysms, *débâcles*, Revolutions and Reformations, the crisis and the *coup d'état*, are just summer storms, and nothing more—rocket-practice—a tremendous row, and no execution. If we are to restore the Church, and to recreate society, it must not be by a break-up of existing institutions: we deprecate a crash. *Reculer pour mieux sauter*, is a safe maxim; some among us seem disposed to reverse it into *Sauter pour pis reculer*. Opinion will be influenced—life formed—saints trained—the will educated—authority secured—by growth: we can never transplant full-grown trees: they will not acclimatize, and the soil rejects them. And therefore, as it seems Ireland is not to be set right, either by replacing the Protestant Establishment with its Romanist antagonist, even admitting the failure of the former to be greater than we believe, or the purity of the latter to be unquestionable, which we are very far from suggesting; first, because such is not the course of nature, and next, because nothing is gained by substituting one questionable system for another negative one, because the equation is not solved by writing *y* instead of *x*; we say that in so far as Mr. Sewell and Lord Adare seek to restore Ireland by other influences than Boyne Water—the glorious memory (of a Dutch usurper)—Orange flags, and the King of Hanover, we will hail their success; their *method* is at least right.

Mr. Thackeray seems to think, (vol. ii. p. 326,) that the formation of a "middle-class" in Ireland would be its panacea; and in another place, (ibid. p. 219,) he seems to think that not so much "Protestantism but Scotchism—meaning thrift, prudence, perseverance, boldness, and common sense—are the secret of the commercial prosperity in the North of Ireland:" well, if he can make his middle-class other than the heartless set of small tradesmen and small clerks and small officials, the "shabby-gentle," the *Dii minorum gentium*, who pass under that denomination in England, and who are, we verily believe, the most cold-blooded, badly taught, unimpressible set of miseries, with

which the world was ever cursed—the especial bane and blight, though the natural growth, of a trading community—and if he can keep thrift and the rest of his constellation of economical graces and virtues tolerably at work with any sense of religion, perhaps a “middle-class” would do the work of Ireland; but we would rather see Ireland as it is, in rags, penury, oppression, misgovernment, and famine, that is, in persecution, than in the “prosperity” of Birmingham and Manchester. The state of the mud cabins of Connaught and Munster, if their inhabitants be such as impartial men tell us, that is, chaste, religious, and uncomplaining, is higher in the favour of Almighty God than the respectable “gent.” who “rents a pew”—no, half a one—in the district church at Manchester, and criticises the sermon and Puseyism, and reads the *Morning Chronicle*, and subscribes his “one pound one” to the National School; and all because he thinks it the correct thing to patronise the Church, which is what *we* understand by “prudence, common sense, and Protestantism” on this side of the Channel.

From the commencement of this article our readers—especially those who delight in finding fault, and writing letters to the ecclesiastical newspapers—might have anticipated some choice extracts from the lighter portions of the *Irish Sketch-Book*; we have purposely disappointed them, confining ourselves to the serious parts of a very readable and entertaining, and, in its way, instructive pair of volumes. If they are disposed for the fun, we commend them to Mr. Titmarsh himself: his trip to the Giant’s Causeway and his party to Killarney, will not disappoint them: they do not quite suit our pages; and if any choose to cavil at the inconsistency of our early speculations on the philosophy of ridicule, and our subsequent hints on Irish matters, we choose to plead considerable license, in the way of juxtaposition on everything connected with Ireland. Mr. Thackeray’s book is quite as inharmonious and inconsecutive as our paper. We shall do enough for truth if we vindicate the propriety of a laugh on proper occasions and with proper associations; and this as a principle—not careless, nor, on the other hand, not anxious whether we cause a laugh or not. The right use of ridicule is a matter of no frivolous importance, nor unconnected with Ethical truth. And as we are reviewing the work of a professional jokester, though one from whom we anticipate future earnestness, as he has shown present sincerity, it formed as good an opportunity as another to speak out. Whether we have established a sufficient connexion between Ireland and the final cause of fun, we cannot say. Mr. Titmarsh will be glad enough to stand for the middle term—the link of connexion.

---

1. *Observations on the Management of the Poor in Scotland, and its Effects on the Health of the Great Towns.* By W. PULTENEY ALISON, M.D. Fellow and late President of the Royal College of Physicians, Edinburgh. 1840. Second Edition.
2. *Reply, &c.* By W. P. ALISON. 1840.
3. *Reply to Dr. Chalmers's Objections, &c.* By W. P. ALISON. 1841.
4. *Report of the Commissioners of Poor Law Inquiry in Scotland, with Appendix.* 1844.

THERE are two opposite views of the manner in which those who have property, that is, the few, should deal with those who have none, that is, with the greater part of mankind. Christianity enjoins liberal almsgiving; and many Christian nations, of whom England is one, have given to the poor a right, by law, to public relief in sickness, in old age, and even in health, if the healthy labourer can find no employment. This last provision led to abuse, by making the labourer careless of satisfying his employer, and, in 1835, a change was made in our Poor Law by the government of Lord Grey. It was, doubtless, necessary to check such abuses of the old law, but the principles on which the new one was upheld by many, and particularly by Lord Brougham, were harsh, and, as can now be proved, visionary; belonging to a philosophy which, for shortness, we will call Scotch. It is a mongrel between Ethics of a very sentimental cast, and a Political Economy that is very like individual stinginess. Its first principle is, that every man must depend upon his own exertions; whence it infers that those who have not provided for themselves must suffer, as an example to others; and that the rich man must on no account interfere with this course of natural justice, by giving to a poor man a shilling. Hence Lord Brougham stated, in the House of Lords, that he only tolerated in the New Poor Law the provision for old people, who ought themselves to lay by means for their age; and that he objected even to general hospitals, because all men might provide for the general risk of disease; though he would allow hospitals for fevers and for broken bones, which men are not bound to anticipate in their own cases; and which Dr. Chalmers, therefore, calls institutional maladies. This great principle of non-interference is bolstered up by two minor principles, derived one from each of the two parent sciences. Political economy teaches that nothing but the fear of distress can prevent persons from marrying hastily, and that therefore, by relieving the offspring of imprudent marriages—that is to say, of

any marriage, because it is assumed that if the offspring be in distress, the marriage must have been an imprudent one—by relieving, therefore, such offspring, say the Scotch philosophers, you break down the great preventive check of Mr. Malthus. The other subsidiary principle is the sentimental one. If you speak of a widow with five children, and no wages, living in a hut upon potatoes, scantily supplied by a brother, whose family can ill spare them, or begged from door to door, and if you propose some parish dole for this widow and her children, you are asked how you can tamper with such a beautiful efflux of feeling, and are told that you seek to destroy the domestic charities of the nation. Thus, the received doctrine of Scotland was unassisted exertion of the labourer, founded on the preventive check, and on the domestic affections: its Poor Law embodied that doctrine, and the condition of the Scotch labourer was appealed to as one of perfect comfort, produced by absolute independence. So confidently was the superiority of his condition to that of the Englishman asserted, that no one doubted it. But, four years since, Dr. Alison, late President of the Royal College of Physicians at Edinburgh, published a pamphlet, in which he overturned both the Scotch theory and the Scotch practice; showing that the Scotch poor did not make provision for future calamities, but fell into penury and starvation, under old age or disease; and that neither were the domestic affections fostered by that starvation, nor improvident marriages checked, but, on the contrary, encouraged by the recklessness of Scotch destitution. "The higher ranks in Scotland," he wrote boldly, "do much less for the relief of poverty, and of sufferings resulting from it, than those of any other country in Europe which is really well regulated;" and, on the other hand, "the female labourers live in a condition to which that of most animals is a luxury." So that the experiment was tried without flinching, but with what effect? "The truth is," he says elsewhere, "that below a certain grade of poverty the preventive check of moral restraint has no power. Twenty-five years' observation of the habits of the poor, have shown me that there are none among whom population makes so rapid progress, as those who see continually around them examples of utter destitution and misery. In such circumstances, men hardly look forward to the future more than animals." And he brings forward, in aid of his experience, the Irish Poor Law Commission, who report from Kerry as from Donegal: "The poorer the individuals are, the more anxious are they to marry." So that, though the rich Scotchmen button up their breeches pockets, the poor are no better off, but the female labourers fare worse than the cattle on the farms; and yet Mr. Malthus's preventive check will not work, since the poorer people are, the faster they marry. We must not forget, however, the efflux of

private sympathy that must arise from so much independence. Let us see what the sympathy does :—

"Widows and orphans," says Dr. Alison, "gather cinders on the streets late at night and early in the morning; they beg for bread, wherever they are permitted, and, if repelled from the rich, they seek for *sympathy* among the poor. Three meals in the week will support life for many weeks. I have known instances where I had satisfactory moral proof that the mothers of such families have submitted, for the sake of their children, to such privations for months together."

So that the sympathy which the Edinburgh Professor preaches upon three meals a day, produces to the Edinburgh widow just three in the week. But, though sympathy puts these poor widows upon short allowance, the Scotch poor laws, since they yield plenty of starvation, should, according to Scotch theory, produce a great harvest of sympathy, which of itself is a very fine thing. Unfortunately, however, we find, from the evidence before the Scotch Poor Law Commissioners, that sons have lately acquired the habit of turning their decrepit fathers out of doors. For Dr. Alison, by his writings, awakened so much sense of justice in Scotland, as led to the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry into the Scotch Poor-Laws; and these Commissioners have just produced three folio volumes, about 2500 pages of evidence, which we have nearly read through. Their short-hand writer's pen, guided by stern reality, chalks out scenes of humble life, which differ from those of Burns or of Scott, as much as Crabbe's Parish Register from Virgil's Eclogues.

The Report itself deals in generalities, and ends by recommending a board, not of supervision, but of perpetual inquiry. The six Scotch Commissioners, indeed, partly as being inured to the sight of misery in their streets, partly as politicians who shrink from committing themselves, and with some justification perhaps, as knowing their countrymen's intractable temper, we might expect not to speak very plainly; but the only Englishman on the Commission has refused to sign that Report, and has expressed, in a manly protest, his sense of its impotence. Sharing in his indignation, believing that the Scotch poor suffer cruel wrong from the citizens and land-owners of Scotland, and knowing that this national wrong can be redressed only by such an expression of public opinion as enables a Government to overcome interested opposition, we shall try to help the poor of Scotland by extracting portions of the evidence; and, not having space for one-tenth of the bitter facts which these three folios contain, shall give as much of the evidence as we can, and add a few remarks of our own.

As a standard of reference, the practice of a well-managed



Union in the south of England should first be stated, under the three principal heads of distress, sickness, widowhood, and old age. It is as follows: if a labourer be laid up by illness, he is visited regularly by a salaried surgeon, who orders for him medicine, and also mutton and wine if necessary, at the cost of the parish. His allowance is made at the rate of 14*d.* per week for each inmate of the family; so that, if he have a wife and four children, he will receive during illness 8*s.* weekly, subject to deduction for earnings, if any, on the part of his family; a widow with four children will, by the same rule, receive 6*s.* 8*d.* weekly. An old woman past work will receive 2*s.* 6*d.*; an old man 3*s.*; an old couple 5*s.* weekly, at their own homes, which they are not compelled to quit for the workhouse. These sums are not held out as magnificent stipends, but, on the contrary, are stated as being the lowest amounts which the guardians, chiefly farmers, think they can pay to the poor from their own purses. Let us now cross the Tweed. In the border counties of Berwick and Roxburghshire, we see, indeed, the children and young women without shoes or stockings; we perceive in the streets a detestable stench, arising from the want of domestic decency, and cottages, generally with only one room and one floor, in which single room the whole family live by day and sleep at night, within two large cupboards called box-beds. But this hovel we have already seen in Northumberland, and, excepting the want of shoes and of cleanliness, we see no striking marks of inferiority in the state of Scotch peasants. On turning to the blue-book of evidence, we find that the English Poor-Law has been introduced, by a happy contagion, in these two border counties—in Roxburghshire for a century; for the ordinary provision, from collections at the church-doors, having been found inadequate for the relief of the poor, a compulsory assessment was made upon that county in 1746. Still we find, from the evidence, many deficiencies, even in these two border counties. In sickness the poor have generally no stated allowance; and, in many parishes, the medical men have to visit them, and to find medicines for them, at their own cost, according to the general practice of Scotland; nor is any nutritious diet provided. We may quote Mr. Stuart, surgeon of Kelso:—

“Does your practice lead you to the English side of the border?—Occasionally; but not among the poor at all.

“You are not able to form a comparison between the poor on this side and on the other?—I think the condition of the poor much better on the other side of the water than on this. The allowances are much greater than on this side of the Tweed.

“Would you say they are better as regards houses?—No. I think they are much the same.

“Their living is better?—Yes. We frequently have paupers living here, who draw allowances from English parishes.”

"*Mr. Twisleton.*—In cases of sickness, is nutritious diet not afforded from the sessional funds?—Not at all.

"Is extra relief not given?—Occasionally we get a few shillings, but with great difficulty. It is always with great difficulty that 5*s.* even can be got. There is not a medical man who has not to go and beg for it as for a thing he has no right to ask; and a person may call from time to time without success."

Dr. Douglas, of Hawick, also says:—

"A case occurred of an old man above eighty, in the parish of Cavers, the nature of whose complaint required witness's attendance twice a day. He rode nine miles from Hawick night and morning for several days to visit him, and when he sent in his account for attendance on him, although he was on the poor-roll of the parish, the heritors threw it out. Witness is often put to expense for the sick poor, besides giving them his attendance."

Dr. Douglas, of Kelso, says generally:—

"The agents who act for the proprietors here, thinking they are serving their masters, to save their money, *do squeeze the poor, and severely.*"

The heritors, that is, landowners, it should be observed, pay one-half of the poor-rates; and we find altogether a more parsimonious management than in England. The allowance to old people is about 2*s.* a week, instead of 2*s.* 6*d.* or 3*s.* We find also general complaints of the number of beggars who wander about the county, driven to this life by the impossibility of finding relief in other counties. The police have endeavoured to put them down. The superintendent of the Roxburghshire police states:—

"Has been four years superintendent of police in the county of Roxburgh. His general instructions with regard to vagrants are to suppress them as much as he can. There are still immense quantities of them going through the county; they are generally confirmed beggars, persons who live by begging and would not work. They are of all the three countries, but the greater proportion of them are Scotch. The same parties frequently return into the county; they are then frequently apprehended and carried before a justice of the peace, who deals with them as vagrants. Witness finds great difficulty in making any suggestion with regard to the more effectual suppression of vagrancy. Some of the vagrants are quite incorrigible; all the severity exercised upon them has been of no avail. He knows half a dozen persons who have been begging for years; and though they imprison them when they return, it does not prevent them from coming back again periodically. It will be impossible to put down vagrancy as long as beggars are harboured by the farmers. Witness has gone round to the farm-houses, and got the masters to agree neither to serve nor harbour vagrants; but then *their wives scout him, and tell him that they are in the will of God Almighty, and that as long*

*as they have a handful of meal or a pickle of straw, they will not turn the beggar from their door."*

—When the reader knows the mode in which these vagrants are treated at home, he will take the part of the farmers' wives against the policeman. There is another practice also found in these border counties which deserves notice, and the more so because the report strangely denies its existence in the teeth of the evidence. The inhabitants of the Scotch towns complain that their rates are increased by the farm labourers, who flock in when no longer able to work in the fields. The commissioners find, however, that the allowances in the country are often better than in the towns, and they ask, How can it be true that the labourers leave the villages for the towns, seeking a lower rate of allowance? Independently of the evidence to the fact thus denied, the answer to the question is plain enough. The labourer has not the choice of remaining in his own village. His cottage is generally an appendage to the farm-house; and when he is no longer able to follow the plough, that is, between the age of fifty and sixty, he is turned out of doors to make room for a younger hind. He then hangs about some town, where, after three years' residence, he acquires a claim to such provision for his old age as the laws of Scotland afford. This system of turning the labourer out of his cottage also bears on another point,—that independence of character for which Scotchmen who wish to do nothing for the old labourer praise him so much, meaning, by independence, unwillingness to ask his parish for help. The following questions and answers throw some light on this independence. The minister of Ladykirk is asked:—

"Do you find any reluctance among your people in applying for relief?—There is very great reluctance, but from a peculiar cause; not from reluctance to accept the support to which they are entitled, but a reluctance arising from an apprehension lest they might give offence to the heritors. I know a great many instances of this as compared with the population of the parish. During the last six months I have known four or five cases, which I think ought to have been admitted on the poor-roll; but knowing that the consequence might have been expulsion from the houses they occupy, *upon that ground they refuse to apply.*

"You mean they refuse to apply for relief, lest they should be turned out of the houses they occupy?—Yes.

"By what tenure do they hold those houses?—By annual rent; and the houses are the property of one or more of the heritors. Cases having occurred in which poor people, who have applied for relief, were ejected, many are reluctant to apply.

"Were these rents paid directly to the heritor, or to the tenant of the farm on which the poor lived?—Directly to the landlord.

"Since they are objects proper to be admitted to the roll, how did they continue to pay their rents?—Generally by making hay, or

cutting down corn, or working in the field during summer—some slight work which did not require much labour, but which they were competent for. They had work for about six weeks in the year.

“And could those persons not work except for those six weeks?—I should say many of them,—aged females for instance, from sixty to sixty-five years of age, unable to work much, and *fairly entitled, I should say, to admission on the poor roll.*”

“Then their earnings would barely pay their house-rent?—Very little more.”

There are other hardships even in these border counties, but as there is a long road to travel, we will now ask the reader to accompany us a stage further from England, along the sea-shore on the high road to Edinburgh, through East Lothian, over fertile plains well manured, and teeming with produce, where cattle, sheep, and horses are equally fat; everything, in short, is well fed and well housed, except worn out ploughmen, widows, and orphans. We will stop at the ancient and picturesque burgh of Dunbar, with its ruined castle beetling over the German ocean. Here the commissioners, in January last, called before them the late provost, who says:—

“The fishing population in Dunbar are, generally speaking, very improvident. Their gains are at times large; yet if a storm happens, so as to throw them out of work for a fortnight or three weeks, they are reduced to great misery. Their houses are very wretched: *the windows are often unglazed, and the bedding of the worst description.* There are some exceptions to this, but very few.”

Thus it appears, that if parochial repletion promotes improvidence, parochial stinginess does not prevent it. What the allowances are which co-exist with this improvidence we may hear from the burgh's present Provost, who states that he—

“Has been connected with the council for sixty years. The magistrates have not taken any charge of the poor-funds for many years. The whole management is left to the kirk-session. Witness considers that the poor of the town are very scantily provided for. He cannot think that 2s. or 3s. a month can be sufficient for them. Many of those who have only 2s. or 3s. a month, have nothing to depend upon except the charity of the public. *His opinion would not be altered if he knew that some of them had 5s. or 6s. a month.*”

Nor would ours: nor can we be surprised at hearing from the Rev. David Logan, who has been minister of a neighbouring parish for twenty years:—

“The parish is infested with beggars from Dunbar, Haddington, Tranent, and Dalkeith. Witness knows as a fact, that some of the persons begging in Stenton are paupers on the roll at Haddington and Dunbar. They have stated that to him themselves. It is not uncommon in his parish for farm servants past work to leave the

farms upon which they were employed, and go into the village of Stenton, or even to the neighbouring towns of Dunbar and Haddington. The aged persons who go away in that manner, have seldom saved money. A hind's wages this year, in places where potato crops have failed, will not be more than 8s. a week. There is a class of persons in the parish, who are called 'outworkers,' or 'bondagers.' They are for the most part females. They have a house, for which they shear twenty days, and they are allowed to plant 600 yards of potatoes. They are bound to work every day when they are called upon, receiving 9d. a day, but receiving nothing upon those days upon which they do not work. They may be employed, on an average, four days a week. Their condition during the winter months, when their services are less frequently required, is often very miserable. This system prevails generally throughout the county."

Thus it further appears, that the absence of relief to able-bodied labourers does not secure them good wages even in highly farmed districts. What is the provision for the sick poor we hear from Mr. Turnbull, surgeon, who is paid, indeed, but at the rate of six guineas a-year for attendance and medicine, the population of Dunbar being 4,395 persons—whose evidence deserves to be read.—

"Has been a medical practitioner in Dunbar since September, 1832. Has been employed by the session of Dunbar to attend the paupers upon the poor-roll since ever he commenced practice. Is paid a salary of 6l. 6s. a-year for so doing, which includes medicines as well as attendance. Sometimes there is a good deal of fever among the poorer classes. Last year there were about fifty cases of fever, but only two of them were fatal. In visiting the houses of the poor, he finds them in many cases *very insufficiently provided with the necessaries of life*. They have always beds, but the bedding is always insufficient. Witness considers that the poor are more liable to disease on account of the insufficiency of their food. Typhus fever is the most frequent disorder amongst them. Witness can hardly distinguish the poor on the roll from the other classes of poor. There is no dispensary in the town, and they all come to him alike. There is one thing which tends greatly to aggravate disease amongst the poorer classes generally, that when they are ill, there is great difficulty in procuring for them the necessary quantity of *common food*. A certificate is required for every loaf of bread that is given out by the session, in cases of illness. There is also the greatest difficulty in procuring wine or cordials. In the fever with which the town was visited last year, wine and cordials were more necessary for the cure even than medicine. Witness does not find many cases of disease arising from intemperance alone. There is a considerable deal of intemperance among the poor. Some of the people are filthy in their habits. A general cleansing of the town took place at the time of the cholera; *but since that time there has never been anything regularly done.*"

So we thought when we were last in Dunbar. Proceeding to

Haddington, a better-looking town, the capital of East Lothian, we yet find its provost stating that he—

“Has been seven years provost of Haddington, and has been forty-five years resident in the town. He is in the habit of attending the meetings of the heritors and kirk-session relative to the management of the poor. He has always been of opinion that the allowances to the poor have been too small. When the poor have no friends, their livelihood is generally eked out by begging.”

Dr. Cook, the minister of Haddington, shows that the amount of these allowances is about half of the standard in the English union, to which we have referred:—

“The ordinary allowance to a single old person, is 1s. 6d. a week. An old man and his wife would get about 2s. 6d. a week. A widow with four children under twelve, would get 2s. 6d. or 3s. a week.”

With regard to the neighbourhood, Mr. Graham, minister of North Berwick, shows the same neglect of the sick poor; and, though the place is famous for its farming, there is also great distress even among the able-bodied labourers.—

“Nothing is paid by the session for medical attendance on the paupers. Witness has proposed to the heritors that this should be done, but it has never been adopted. There is a doctor resident in the parish; he supplies both medicines and attendance out of his own pocket. There were a good number of men unemployed in the parish last winter during two or three months. No relief was given them except by private charity. They were very eager to work, but could not find employment. They were persons of good character, and had been provident when in the receipt of wages.”

But let us hasten forward, following the sea-shore to Edinburgh; not, however, now to contemplate its romantic crags, rock-built castle, royal palace, antique streets, or Grecian porticoes, but to inquire how the leading men of this capital and university, which calls itself the Modern Athens, have provided with their substance, or by their doctrine, for the people who dwell around them—that doctrine being, that by withholding from the poor, as much as possible, legal assistance, you ensure to them better wages, teach them habits of providence, strengthen their mutual affection, and give them, above all, independence of character; which doctrine, it is asserted, the Scotch have carried into successful practice.

The Commissioners, on their arrival, first called Mr. George Small, treasurer of the Edinburgh workhouse, and asked him as follows:—

“Will you state what is the usual allowance, say, for a widow with one child?—She would get about 6s. in the half quarter.”



"With two?—7s. 6d.

"With three?—About 10s.

"With five?—About 15s. With six, 18s. to 21s.; but rarely the latter.

"What is the general allowance to an aged person who possesses no other means of assistance? For a single individual? First, for a single individual, and secondly a married couple?—They seldom exceed 6s. to any individual case.

"And for a married couple you give an allowance of 2s. a week, or what?—Never more than 7s. 6d. for a married couple for six weeks, unless they are a couple unable to do any thing. In the case of their being bed-ridden.

"Would you give them more if they were bed-ridden?—Yes. I would also state that, when they find the allowance not sufficient, upon application, they are offered the house. If they prefer in-door relief, they are admitted. If they say the allowance is not sufficient for their support out of doors, then they are offered the house uniformly.

"What distinction is there made betwixt the claims of those who have a settlement, and those who have not a settlement, in your parish, as to relief?—If they are in poverty and distress in the parish, we must relieve them in the meantime, just as we do our own, till we find their parish.

"And that is your practice?—That is our practice."

It should be observed that the allowances are computed no longer by the week, as in England, or the month, as on the Borders, but by the half quarter, or six weeks; yet the sums allowed, so far from increasing in proportion to the term of reckoning, do not, at least for an old married couple, much exceed what they would receive in the south of England for a single week. As we proceed north, we shall find, unfortunately for the poor, the term still lengthening, while the sum paid remains a fixed quantity. If, however, the applicants find their allowance too meagre, Mr. Small states broadly that they have uniformly the choice of entering the workhouse. Yet, further on, in his evidence, we find the following questions and answers:—

"Are applications ever made by persons who have a small allowance, to be admitted to the workhouse?—Oh, frequently.

"Are those applications often refused on the ground that there is not sufficient room?—In some cases they must be refused. *There are several men whom we cannot at present admit.*

"Unless the workhouse were on a larger scale, you would not be able to take in additional numbers?—No.

"Therefore, if parties complained of the smallness of their allowance, you could not, on a large scale, take them into the workhouse? *We could not.*"

Thus it appears that the poor to whom these miserable half-quarterly payments are tendered, have not, in practice, the alter-

native afforded them by the English law. This officer also states that strangers applying for relief are relieved like parishioners until their parish is discovered. On the other hand, a notice had been put up at the workhouse, that none need apply save those who had settlements in the parish; a notice clearly illegal, since by the Scotch, as by the English law, destitute wayfarers are entitled to relief until their parish is found. There is some doubt how long this illegal principle was avowed, but there is no doubt that it is virtually acted upon by a system of passes, under which applicants, if the slightest doubt can be thrown on their settlement, are sent at once, sometimes dying, in open carts, from one side of Scotland to the other, and thence bandied back again. Capt. Thomson, treasurer of the House of Refuge, shows how difficult it is for a destitute person in Edinburgh to obtain a hearing from the managers of the *charity* workhouse.

"Have you had communication with country parishes about parties having claims on them?—People came to us. The police, or a gentleman, or a lady, brought a person found destitute to the house of refuge. I sat for three or four hours daily. Managers sometimes attended. I sat every day, and investigated the cases. The usual way in which the matter was done, with respect to the parishes, was by finding from all present where the applicant had been residing. First satisfying myself that the person was one who required some assistance, and then, when the parish was one on which I thought they had a claim (I was very often imposed upon), I wrote to that parish. If it was in the neighbourhood, Edinburgh, or the West Kirk, or Leith, I called on the managers, and did what I could to get them to recognize the claim.

"And when you had a clear case, did they listen to it?—Oh, far from it. I had generally the clearest case, and could make nothing of it. I never applied when I had any doubt of the applicant's claim.

"And was no measure resorted to?—Every measure that could be taken. We repeatedly applied to the sheriff, but we had so many obstacles. I, as treasurer, drew up formal memorials. I did not apply in the sheriff-court, but enclosed the memorials to the sheriff without employing an agent. Since the present sheriff was appointed, he has referred us to Jas. Anderson, Esq., 2, Hay Street, an agent for the poor; but they pay little attention to the matter."

Dr. Pitcairn, again, session-clerk of St. George's parish, speaks most strongly as to the difficulty of obtaining relief, and its utter inadequacy when obtained.

"Do you think it would be desirable to increase the allowance from the charity workhouse to the poor?—Yes, I regard the allowance made to paupery as a perfect mockery.

"Do you think it would be proper to raise an additional assessment for that purpose?—I should think that in large towns it is necessary.

"I mean, would it be advisable to increase the assessment, so as to increase the allowance to the poor by the charity workhouse?—I would certainly give the charity workhouse as little as possible.

"How would you propose to do it?—By a board of management, or in some other way. I regard the charity workhouse as a perfect monster. It is of no use. I think that district boards would be better; and almshouses, and houses of refuge, in the most destitute localities of the city particularly.

"In what respect is the charity workhouse objectionable?—First, there is not sufficient accommodation in it to maintain the poor that apply for entrance. There are many more applications for admission than they can possibly take. And, next, the funds placed at their disposal are inadequate to the wants of the poor of Edinburgh. I know that in all cases where it is necessary to make application to them individually, it is done with a great deal of labour and trouble; and a personal canvass of the managers is often necessary to obtain alimēt; and, after it has been obtained, I have known fathers and mothers of families of six, seven, and eight children, get about 4s. a month.

Such, then, being the system of managing the poor at Edinburgh, let us see how it works; and let us first hear the ministers of the city parishes, remembering that not only the Scotch poor law, but the principle of that law, is on its trial as to its effect upon the minds of the poor, as well as upon their wretched and attenuated bodies. What says the Rev. Dr. Gordon, minister of the High Church parish?

"Be good enough to tell us in what situation the outdoor pensioners in your parish are, in point of comfort.—Generally speaking, indeed almost without exception, in a very poor state. The allowance made to them by the charity workhouse, is very far indeed below anything like a decent subsistence; or, in fact, I would say, that *the allowance generally made, is not sufficient to keep them in existence at the lowest possible rate of living.*

"Do any of them subsist partly on other means—means raised from other sources belonging to themselves?—Some of them are able to do a little work; but, generally speaking, it is by private charity that that alimēt is supplemented or increased.

"Have you had occasion to observe any of them having other means of subsistence by work, or deriving aid from the charity of neighbours?—I know many of them who are not able to do anything for themselves, but I cannot conceive that they subsist entirely on the allowance of the charity workhouse. I do not think it possible that they can do so.

"Have you any other observations to make in regard to the state of those persons who are on the list of the charity workhouse, excepting what you have already stated?—Nothing in regard to their circumstances. I am satisfied, that the smallness of the allowance made to them from public charity is one of the means of increasing and propagating all those bad habits which extreme destitution creates;—that is, begging, and using all sorts of arts in order to extort charity from the benevolent.

"Is it the practice of the poor to support their aged parents?—Whenever you find persons who have not lost a sense of self-respect, you will always find them entertaining great respect for their parents, and a disposition to aid them as far as they possibly can; *but I am sorry to say that that feeling is considerably broken down from destitution.*

"Then destitution does not tend to promote the feeling of affection among them?—No; it renders them callous and reckless even in regard to themselves personally."

Let us hear another minister, the Rev. J. Hunter, of the Tron Church; and we must observe that the evidence given generally by the ministers throughout Scotland is much to their credit.

"You are in the habit of visiting the poor of your parish?—Yes.

"Do you visit those poor who are not on the roll, receiving relief from the charity workhouse—outdoor pensioners?—I visit the whole of my parishioners of all descriptions.

"Have you inquired into the amount of allowances they receive from the charity workhouse?—Yes.

"Do you consider the amount generally sufficient to maintain them?—Certainly not. It is quite inadequate.

"Could they possibly exist on it unless they had other resources?—Certainly not.

"Are you aware of what the resources are on which they depend?—Public begging; and I fear that it leads to lying and stealing, and imposition on the public.

"Is it your opinion that the small allowance given by the charity workhouse degrades exceedingly the character of those receiving it?—Certainly.

"*And destroys their moral feelings?*—Yes.

"You are aware that there are classes of outdoor pensioners—one, who are supposed to have something to eke out their allowance; another, who are admitted to have no visible means of subsistence?—Yes.

"Then it is to that latter class that the observations you have made more particularly apply?—Chiefly so. That latter class, in my parish, prevail to a very considerable extent. Except the resource they have in public begging, they have hardly any other mode of eking out the little money they have from the charity workhouse. At the same time, it is right to state, that my parish is one of the poorest in Edinburgh. There is hardly a parish in the city in which there is greater misery and poverty than in the Tron Church parish.

"The amount of allowances which such individuals receive from the charity workhouse forms but a small portion of their subsistence?—I should certainly conceive it does; and some of them are reduced to such a state as to be almost absolutely famished. I visited a part of my parish on Friday last, and *in all the houses I found persons destitute of food, and completely destitute of fuel; without an article of furniture; without beds or bedding, the inmates lying on straw.*

"What is the state of the labouring poor generally in your parish who are not reduced to such circumstances as to require parochial

aid?—It is generally very bad. As I stated before, it is one of the poorest parishes in Edinburgh; and *a large portion of the labouring poor in it are unemployed.*

“Are there many strangers among the number?—Yes; there is a very considerable number of those whom we call lodgers. There are lodging-houses in the parish; perhaps, in one small apartment, a dozen or fourteen persons may be crowded together. There is often a great deal of filth in such apartments. A policeman, who may not be supposed to be very delicate in nerves and feelings, fainted on visiting one of these lodging-houses in consequence of the stench.”

These statements are so important, that, in order to put the matter out of doubt, if there be any doubt, we will call one more minister, the Rev. T. Guthrie, of St. John’s Church, Edinburgh, whose evidence is very strong.

“Do you think the present allowances not enough?—I think them miserably deficient.

“You, of your own knowledge, can say that respectable persons with larger allowances would not make a bad use of them?—In many cases they would require double what they receive; and in many instances, people have no choice but to steal or starve. I may be allowed to add, that I know the system has a most immoral effect—a most injurious effect—on the habits of the people; and elders and deacons are averse to go among the poor, because they have to look upon a vast amount of temporal misery which they cannot relieve. I have trembled often when I have gone at the call of duty to visit the receptacles of wretchedness, because I felt that I could not relieve the misery which I must look upon; and in such cases, nothing but a sense of duty could compel me to go and visit the poor.

“Do you think these small allowances promote a spirit of independence amongst the people?—*I think the very reverse; and I shall tell you why,—because they are obliged to resort to begging, which never can promote the spirit of independence among the people.*

“Do you think they promote kindly feelings among relations towards each other?—No—I can’t say I think they do. No doubt, they lead relations to do something for their friends, rather than see them starve.

“Is it common for parents to leave their children under the present system?—I find many instances in which parents abandon their children.

“Abandon them altogether?—Abandon them altogether.

“May that not arise from the knowledge that the children will be provided for by the parish?—No: I think it arises from the wretchedly low state to which they have fallen,—so low, that I have sometimes seen parents glad when their children died.

“Then it is your impression that the allowance is not enough?—Certainly not.

“It tends to destroy their habits?—It tends to destroy their habits, and to extinguish the very feelings of human nature.

“Do you conceive the moral effect of such a supply, on an emergency, to be less favourable as regards the individuals relieved than

would be the moral effect of a legal provision?—A legal provision for the wants of the people would be less injurious than the present system, forcing them, as it does, to the meanest shifts, and driving them to the distribution of their little property among the pawn-brokers.”

Nor can we omit one statement of a fourth Edinburgh minister, the Rev. T. Clark, of the Old Church.

“You are one of the parish ministers of Edinburgh?—Yes.

“Have you had frequent occasion to see the state of the lower classes in your parish?—Since I came to Edinburgh, I have had much intercourse with them; but my time here has been very short.

“How long have you been here?—Since the month of August 1841.

“A considerable number of the inhabitants of your parish is composed of the lower classes?—A great majority.

“Have you had occasion to visit their dwellings?—I have been in every house at least once, and in many of them twenty times, during the period already mentioned.

“That includes both those who receive parochial relief, and those who do not?—It includes every inhabitant in the parish.

“Are there many in a very destitute state?—*I was not the least aware that such destitution existed in Scotland.*

“Does that state extend to a large portion of those who receive parochial relief?—To the most of those who do receive parochial relief. Those who do receive parochial relief are not the most destitute. I mean in all cases.

“Are those who are not receiving parochial relief the able-bodied?—*There are a great many females who seem to have no visible means of subsistence, and are in a state of positive starvation.*

“Have you any knowledge of the general causes of destitution—whether it arises from intemperance or the want of employment?—No doubt a great deal of the destitution is caused by want of employment; and my belief also is, that a great portion arises from intemperance. But I have a strong impression, at the same time, that much of this arises from want of sympathy towards them, and want of superintendence of any kind. *They have stated to me, that they regarded themselves as outcasts from the sympathy of their fellow-men.*

“Do you think their state of extreme destitution has been caused by intemperance?—It must have been growing for a long time; but intemperance adds greatly to the evil. They exist, for weeks together, without the least portion of fire, and, for days together, without tasting food.

“Are they all supplied with water?—Last summer they were not; but, altogether, they are very disagreeable places to visit. But, amidst all the evidence I have had of actual starvation, the strongest proof of it is, that I have seen them lift out of the gutter green herbs, which they devoured greedily, and the offal of fish.”

We are bound to believe, and do believe, that many other Scotchmen, as well as Mr. Clark, “were not aware that such



destitution existed in Scotland." But Mr. Guthrie is asked, whether an allowance might not injure the independence of these unfortunate people; and he answers at once, "I find none who are less independent than those who go and beg in the way of private charity." The following question and his answer are also well worth attention:—

"Would you take into consideration their ability to do something?—Surely; while, at the same time, I must say that such ability may be taken too much into account. A woman is left with six children. It is said the woman can work; and she goes out to wash, or to dress, or to sew. She is from home from six o'clock in the morning till ten o'clock at night. What is the effect? Her children are left on the streets; they grow up blackguards, and become a shame to their friends and a burden to the country. I say, let the woman do her duty. Let the state be a father to her children, and enable her to devote herself to bringing up her children. I would not desire a woman under these circumstances to work."

Now it so happens that, within a few pages of this passage, another witness mentions a case precisely realising the danger which Mr. Guthrie supposes. The case is as follows:—

"I may first, however, state a case in Edinburgh, very interesting to me, from my friend, Duncan M'Laren, having particularly examined the case of a woman and her family. He sent for the woman and took down her story, which he showed to me. She had *six* children, *all young*. She had been deserted by her husband; and was obliged to apply for parish aid—she received 2s. 6d. per week. Her own statement was, that she had to go out to wash and work to keep the children alive, and the children went out to beg, and from begging they became thieves, and the girls, as they grew up, went upon the town. The mother attributed the whole of the evil to want of care. There was nobody to take care of them, she being obliged to go out and work for them; and she ascribed their ruin to that cause. In order to see if there was any discrepancy between her account and that which her daughters might give, two of whom were in prison, one of them was examined, and she corroborated entirely what the mother said as to the situation of the family. In a case of this kind, I have no doubt if the children had been cared for, they never would have been in prison. *These two are under sentence of transportation, and two others in prison*, to all appearance training up for the same end."

We must not, however, confine ourselves to the evidence of the ministers—that of the physicians is equally conclusive; and justice should also be done to the exertions of the Edinburgh faculty, voluntary exertions, as the following evidence shows:—

"Are there any means taken to afford medical assistance except in the house?—None, except in the house. I once proposed a plan like

that adopted in Glasgow, where medical assistance is given; but I met with no encouragement to persevere.

"When in bad health, they must fall on the medical charitable institutions?—Chiefly they must, and on the kindness of medical men; Professor Alison in an especial manner."

This is the Dr. Alison whose publications have raised the question of the poor-laws in Scotland, and whose evidence is very striking; but we will rather quote another physician of Edinburgh, Dr. Handyside:—

"Are there any who get no assistance at all though they require it?—Many, very many.

"Does it appear that the destitution of the poor is increasing of late years?—Of late years—materially.

"Do you find the patients in a state of destitution?—So frequently, that the medical men and the students often find it necessary to draw their purses. Since I began with the dispensary I see an increase of those who apply in destitute circumstances. They have often nothing to boil water in—nothing to put their feet in if ordered to bathe their feet—no bread or meal for poultices. It is very usual for the medical men and the students to pay out money for comforts required by patients.

"They don't provide diet?—No; but the medical men frequently contribute wine and soup. It is a customary thing for a medical man to have wine in his house for supplying poor patients; and to have soup ready also, so that a patient may send for a bowl, which is given with bread. The students exhibit the same philanthropic spirit; and they are necessitated to do so, otherwise the disease advances apace."

Such are the efforts of the physicians and students, many of whom die of the fever which constantly prevails in Edinburgh and in other Scotch towns among their half-fed inhabitants; but what account does Dr. Handyside give of the rich citizens?—

"Our general observation is, that the lower the sphere of the individuals to whom application is made, the greater is the liberality displayed.

"Till you come to the lowest?—In the lowest state half of what is got may be given away to persons in the same condition. I have seen them disregard their own health, and the fear of contagion, and starve themselves to aid a suffering and sick neighbour. Not only will they do what they can for those in health, but to a still greater amount for those who are labouring under disease, and from whom there is no prospect of a return.

"You would not wish to put a stop to that benevolence among the poor?—Certainly not.

"Would not a large public provision hinder that efflux?—I scarcely think it would operate thus, or that the efflux of charitable feeling would be exhausted. It cannot now overtake one-tenth of the suffering that prevails. I can give three instances of persons starved to death in the course of the previous winter. The first was received

into one of my wards in the infirmary; another was in another ward in the infirmary; and the third died in his own lodging."

The commissioner is told that one starving man feeds another; and such is the power of political economy, that he is afraid of putting his hand into his breeches pocket lest he should stop this efflux of feeling. The physician tells him that the efflux is stopped by one stronger than a professor,—Death. The commissioner will not believe it; but how strangely does this cant about effluxes contrast with the next question. "Did you open?" The physician tells the commissioner that he did open, and tells him, too, what he found:—

"Did you open?—I opened one, and was present at the examination of the other two. One was my own patient, and, I have no doubt, died from starvation. I have not legal evidence, but I have quite satisfactory evidence of the fact. This was a girl of seventeen. Her mother was a servant. *This poor girl was found lying in one of the most depraved closes in the town. She was taken compassion upon by two prostitutes, who seemed, physically as well as morally, in the worst condition. When the girl was brought in, she was labouring under inflammation of the lungs; her legs were in a state of extensive ulceration; her body in a state of complete prostration and weakness. Due remedies were administered. Notwithstanding, the disease went on. It had been induced from her lying openly in the cold. She died; and with the exception of the rapid disease under which she laboured, there was no unhealthy appearance. Then there were a young man of twenty-five, and a woman of nineteen. They were robust, healthy persons. I can get notes about these persons, though I cannot now state whether they were free from disease. But there are other cases of sudden death from starvation.*"

These two women, themselves "physically in the worst condition," try to save the dying girl. The parish authorities sit warmly at home, afraid of disturbing such effluxes. So it happened to "the man who fell among thieves."

We are certainly anxious to eradicate this notion of effluxes, because we know that it is the last shift of politicians, shielding themselves, under the cloak of sentiment, from the claims of the poor to public assistance. We must, therefore, cite to this point one more witness, Mr. W. Tait, surgeon, of the Edinburgh police:—

"You are surgeon of the Police of Edinburgh?—Yes.

"How long have you been so?—Since May last.

"Before you were surgeon of police, had you an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the poor?—Even more so than since.

"Going to visit them in their dwellings?—Yes.

"Amongst others, those in receipt of parochial relief?—Yes.

"With reference to their allowances from the poor funds, do they seem sufficient to keep them decently?—No; in no instance.

"Have you reason to believe that many of them support themselves by begging?—Yes, I think so.

"And in what other way do they manage to subsist?—A great many go about,—some selling matches, others gathering cinders; and engaged in many such operations.

"Do their relations assist them? Do you find the feeling of family affection strong?—*I don't think it is.* There is affection generally among the poor; but *there is not so strong a feeling among the relations of the poor as among those in better circumstances.*

"It is not your opinion that destitution calls forth feelings of family affection?—I don't think it."

It may be said, however, that the evils, though heavy, which we have stated, apply but to few among the inhabitants of Edinburgh; on the contrary, they apply to a very large proportion indeed of its whole population, as the following answer from Dr. Alison clearly proves:—

"Do you conceive that there are many persons in the West Church parish who have legal claims, and do not receive them?—A great many who receive either nothing, or whose relief is delayed a great deal longer than it ought to be. In regard to the number of persons in destitution beyond what are received on the roll of the parish, I have a number of documents; and the most important of any is the evidence procured by the committee who investigated the town at the time of the distribution of what was called the Prince of Wales' Fund. I have a number of the schedules to show how accurately that was gone into. The general result is, that they found 21,600 in such a state of destitution that they recommended them for gratuitous relief, besides several thousands more whom they recommended to have assistance."

These 21,600, and several thousands more of destitute persons, were found in a single parish of Edinburgh. Mr. Wright, a town-councillor, states what he found upon the same occasion in the Cowgate:—

"I know in the Cowgate great destitution prevails. There is a great portion who have no relief from any charity. I had occasion, in taking up the census, and in visiting with reference to the Prince of Wales' Fund, to make minute inquiries—more particularly in the latter instance I devoted a great deal of time; and only last week I burned two large sheets which I had filled up, and had got certified by some elders of the New North parish, who had devoted great attention to the subject. I think, *in three tenements we had 470 families, which all might be said to be in a state of destitution*; and I don't think there were twenty or thirty who had parish relief. Some went about selling baskets, mats, eggs, fish, &c.; and a great many sold firewood and matches. You can scarcely imagine the way in which they lived.

"*But would you give relief to such persons?*—I don't think they are able to support themselves; but the greatest evil is, that you are

training up one class, their children, to be thieves or prostitutes—they must either steal, or get a living by the vilest means. I have known a woman who has sent her child, not ten or twelve years of age, out to the street, and been a participator in the crime.

“When you say three tenements, do you mean three houses?—I mean three lands.

“How many stories high?—Six or seven, besides some two or three garrets.”

The Rev. T. M'Crie tells us what he sees when he enters such tenements.—

“You say that there are many females in your parish without visible means of subsistence,—what ages?—All ages, from eighty to young girls, but rather old than young. They have no clothing. I have gone into rooms where I found them without clothing.

“Does your description apply to Highlanders and Irish more than to the people who are natives of the lowlands in Scotland?—Certainly not. All these poor people are quite on a level. Nothing can be worse than their habitations.”

Such is the inside of Edinburgh,—a sad contrast to the lofty architecture which hides this mass of unsuspected misery from the admiring traveller. The wretched inhabitants do indeed crawl forth to beg, but the policeman takes them. Mr. Mackay, it is true, the workhouse inspector, when asked whether their paupers ever beg, answers, “Some perhaps, *very profligate ones*.” So also said Mr. Bumble of *Oliver Twist*. But the very governor of the Edinburgh gaol, Mr. Smith, takes a more lenient view.—

“Have you had any persons committed to prison who are regular beggars?—Last year there were 202 committals,—not persons committed, but committals,—for several might be committed two or three times.

“Chiefly for petty theft?—For begging.

“Chiefly women?—No; aged men as well. There were ninety committals in 1841; 202 in 1842; and of these, taking in the two years, the number 60 years old and upwards was upwards of thirty-six, and the number of committals of those 60 years old and upwards, was upwards of seventy-six.

“Have you knowledge whether these occasional beggars are paupers?—A considerable proportion of them are outdoor paupers. This is the last report of the West Church Charity Workhouse; and it appears to contain the names of at least seven who were committed to prison for begging.

“I suppose you always thought, in the case of those committed for begging, that the allowances were inadequate?—Yes. I may mention the allowances of some of the parties. The first is Christian Baptie, aged 72, 3s. 6d. per month; she was once committed to prison for begging. She has been only once, so far as I am aware. The next is Adam Fraser.

"He appears to be 80 years of age?—Eighty-two, as stated in the prison register.

"What allowance has he?—4s. a month."

Is any town-council justified in making to this aged man and woman these trumpery payments, and in forbidding them at the same time from asking of other men bread to feed the flickering flame of life, which the town-council will not maintain in its socket? It seems contrary to the Unwritten Law, which heathens could read in their own hearts, that any magistrate should dare to say to an old destitute man, "I will not feed you myself, brother, and I will not let any one else feed you." Therefore we say, that where no liberal poor laws exist, mendicancy is a sacred right, and that in Edinburgh no town-councillor is entitled to lay his rod upon a beggar's shoulder, nor any workhouse inspector to call him profligate. The town-council should consider, however, that though begging does not prove a man to be profligate, sham relief may occasion begging, and so train up the town's outcast children into profligate men. Mr. Wigham, who had been a manager of the poor, says—"I often wonder that kirk-sessions lose sight of this, and allow their widows with their children to go about begging. It is a perfect manufactory of crime. If we had a good poor-law, and workhouses on a right footing, and an appeal to the sheriff, which would enable them to put an end to begging, I should expect a new era in this country altogether." That begging, justifiable and necessary begging, is a manufactory of crime in this parsimonious and philosophical city, we have proved; but before we quit Edinburgh, we must bring forward one other striking testimony from the governor of its jail.

"Have you many persons brought into the jail of Edinburgh for higher offences than begging, who, you have reason to believe, are paupers?—Frequently. Many youths have grown up to the higher class of offences, who were left destitute or orphans, the father probably dying or deserting; and, in consequence of no attention being paid to them either by the parish or by their mothers, they fall into crime. Two cases suggest themselves to my memory just now—one of a family from Leith, whose father deserted ten years ago. He left five children—two girls and three boys. *We had the whole five in jail at the same time.* The two girls were transported. One of them was removed from the Edinburgh jail to be transported, when one of the boys was in for stealing, and the two younger were in for begging—all at one time.

"Have you had occasion to converse with children of that description about their instruction in religion?—Frequently; and I have found, in most cases, that it has been totally neglected. The mother of these children got 2s. 6/1. per week, out of which she was to support them. The consequence was, she was obliged to go out for work. They went out to beg, and they became thieves and prostitutes. On making a representation, some of them were taken into the house of



refuge. The mother became intemperate. She wished them rather not to go into the house of refuge. She wished that they would rather beg for her."

Mr. Smith is evidently a humane man, and dislikes the system which he is obliged to enforce. But a prison, after all, is not very terrible to an out-door pauper in a Scotch city; and we even find that in Glasgow, the Scotch Manchester, it has no terror at all, as appears from the following extraordinary piece of evidence, given at Edinburgh:—

"At Glasgow, William Brebner, the humane governor of the penitentiary, no doubt with the consent of the commissioners for jails, thought proper to take some voluntary prisoners and keep them after their term of imprisonment was out, if they felt they had no where to go. At one time there were *fifty* of this description; and they *were thankful to submit to all the regulations.*"

The commissioners arriving at Glasgow, to which city we now proceed, examine Mr. Brebner upon the fact, as follows:—

"Are there instances in which parties have wished to remain in prison?—Yes; there is scarcely ever a week but we have some individuals applying to be allowed to remain till some situation can be got; and many of them come applying for admission, and begging to be taken in that they might get work and food.

"Have you taken in any?—Yes.

"How many?—I had at one time above forty of that description—probably a few more.

"Had they ever been in bridewell before?—A few.

"How many were there who had not?—I am not prepared to answer that; but I can give you that also in a tabular form. *I have one just now who has been in upwards of two years—a female—she has no where to go, and is begging hard to be allowed to remain.*

"Had she been convicted of some crime?—No, never. She was quite destitute—she seemed starving at the time. . . . I had a boy here about a week ago, from the house of refuge; he begged and prayed me to take him back—he had not had food or anything during a couple of days."

We need not go into the same detail with regard to this vast city, but may simply state that the evidence already quoted for Edinburgh, applies to Glasgow, with this exception, that whereas the allowances were equally low, a liberal increase had been lately made in some of them. The state of Glasgow, however, must not be passed over. It had been thus described a few years since by an assistant commissioner of the Hand-loom Inquiry:—

"The wynds in Glasgow comprise a fluctuating population of from 15,000 to 30,000 persons. This quarter consists of a labyrinth of lanes, out of which numberless entrances lead into small square courts,

each with a dunghill reeking in the centre. Revolting as was the outward appearances of these places, I was little prepared for the filth and destitution within. In some of these lodging-rooms (visited at night) we found *a whole lair of human beings littered along the floor, sometimes fifteen and twenty, some clothed and some naked; men, women, and children huddled promiscuously together.* Their bed consisted of a layer of musty straw, intermixed with rags. There was generally little or no furniture in these places; the sole article of comfort was a fire. Thieving and prostitution constitute the main sources of the revenue of this population. No pains seem to be taken to purge this Augean pandemonium, this nucleus of crime, filth, and pestilence, existing in the centre of the second city of the empire. These wynds constitute the St. Giles' of Glasgow; but I owe an apology to the metropolitan pandemonium for the comparison. *A very extensive inspection of the lorest districts of other places, both here and on the Continent, never presented anything one half so bad, either in intensity of pestilence, physical and moral, or in extent, proportioned to the population."*

The present commission also receive from the Superintendent of the Glasgow police a similar statement, referring, we suppose, to the same district, that

"In the very centre of the city there was an accumulated mass of squalid wretchedness, which was probably unequalled in any other town in the British dominions—that in the interior part of the square bounded by Saltmarket, Trongate, and Stockwell Streets, and by the River Clyde, as well as in certain parts of the east side of High Street, including the Vennels, Havannah and Burnside, there was concentrated everything wretched, dissolute, loathsome and pestilential. These places are filled by a population of many thousands of miserable creatures. The houses in which they live are altogether unfit for human beings, and every apartment is filled with a promiscuous crowd of men, women and children, in a state of filth and misery. In many of the houses there is scarcely any ventilation. Dunghills lie in the vicinity of the dwellings, and from the extremely defective sewerage, filth of every kind constantly accumulates. In these horrid dens the most abandoned characters of the city are collected,—from whence they nightly issue to disseminate disease, and to pour upon the town every species of abomination and crime."

As to the general state of the poor in Glasgow, another witness gives indirect evidence, by declaring his surprise at the superior condition of those in Manchester, his standard of comparison being taken of course from his own country. He expresses it thus:—

"Have you any personal knowledge of the good effect of the English poor laws on the people at large?—Not farther than I have observed in the visitation I made in Manchester and Liverpool. I observed there was not that heartlessness amongst the poor which might be supposed; they were very frank and open in character. In

Manchester especially, I went round the houses of many of the poor, and found the people cleanly. They seemed to have the utmost confidence in each other, and in the overseers of the poor; they were not afraid to ask relief; they seemed to think they had a right to it. There was a degree of comfort and cleanliness among the poor that was quite pleasing to me, comparing Manchester with the Scotch towns. In Liverpool it is not so much so, arising, I dare say, from there being so many poor Irish there.

"From what you had seen in England of persons receiving parochial relief, what appeared to be the effect of it?—It kept up their appearance; they were more comfortable and cheerful.

"What number of the poor have you seen in England?—I saw a great many in Manchester and Liverpool, and certainly there appeared a decided difference in favour of the English poor. Their houses were clean, and were furnished with a few chairs and a table.

"Did you see 100 of them?—Yes, I was the better part of three days going amongst them."

But the question of comparative comfort, or cheerfulness, or cleanliness, between the English and Scotch cities, appears trifling when we read the following statement made by the Superintendent of the Glasgow police:—

"The fact cannot be concealed that hundreds of persons die annually in Glasgow from diseases brought on by want of proper nourishment, &c.; and from what has come under my own personal observation, I am convinced of the fact, that many persons die in consequence of being treated in their own houses, where they have neither food, fuel, nor clothing, while labouring under fever, and other infectious diseases."

But, as large numbers impress the mind less distinctly than individual scenes, we must examine some houses peculiar to Glasgow,—private poorhouses, in which insane persons and orphans are farmed out to the occupiers of apartments. One of these apartments, kept by a person named Leech, is thus described by Dr. Campbell, formerly a visiting surgeon:—

"What did you find when you went there?—*Twenty-two children* affected with *febricula*, or common fever.

"About how long ago?—About the 15th of April.

"To whom did the children belong?—To the parish of Barony.

"And how many rooms were appropriated for their use?—One.

"All were in one room?—All in one room.

"What was its size?—About *fourteen feet* square, judging according to appearance."

This accumulation of disease in this pesthole, to which orphans are entrusted, was not a novel accident in April 1843; for Dr. Campbell speaks to its previous existence in 1841. And we quote his evidence at length for the case of a woman named Jeans.

"Did you find any fever after that period, June 1841?—It took every individual, with the exception of Andrew Leech himself.

"How do you account for its being so prevalent in the house at this time?—There are four or five children of a woman named Jeans, a parishioner of the Barony, who had been refused parochial relief, though she had these five children under ten years of age. She was at last obliged to take shelter in the night asylum, where she caught typhus, whence she was removed to the Glasgow Royal Infirmary, where she died. The youngest, a child at her breast, was affected: the children were taken to Mr. Maclaren's office, who sent them all out to the house of Andrew Leech, and the contagion spread through the whole house. The woman had been once a most respectable person.

"Do you know how those cases of fever you saw lately in Leech's house were introduced,—how do you know that they were sent to Leech's house by the Barony parish?—First, they were patients of mine; secondly, they were tenants in a property of which I have the charge; thirdly, the authorities of the Barony parish showed me a letter from Aberdeen, setting forth the woman's claim on the parish, and inquired whether the claim was correct, when I answered, it was. The woman, with her husband, had resided in Bridgeton, Barony parish, for fifteen months; in the same land with myself in the Barony parish for twelve months, and in the land adjoining for twelve months—making in all three years and three months. She and her husband removed to Gorbals, where he died of consumption. She returned to her native place, Aberdeen, and applied for parochial relief, her husband having once been a merchant there. Her claim was refused by the parish of Aberdeen. The authorities in Aberdeen transmitted a letter to the parish of Barony, setting forth the statement which I have now made; which letter was shown to me. They still refused her claim; and early in the month of March or April, 1841, the authorities of Aberdeen sent the woman through from Aberdeen to Glasgow, when she called at my house for a certificate of her residence in the Barony.

"Then, when she returned to Aberdeen, the authorities in Aberdeen refused her claim, because she had lost her claim with them, and acquired one in the Barony parish?—Yes.

"And there was no doubt, from the statement you make, that she had acquired a right to relief once in the Barony parish?—It was stated to the relieving officer, in the letter that was sent from Aberdeen, that he had only to apply to me and to another for the truth.

"And what ground did he assign for the refusal?—*None.*"

It will be well to consider what the suffering contained in this true history of the woman named Jeans really was. A merchant of Aberdeen falls into decayed circumstances; removes with his wife and children to Glasgow; after three years is wasted with consumption; dies in Gorbals, one of the suburbs, leaving a wife and five children. The authorities of her native place tell her truly that her claim is on the Barony parish, in Glasgow; write accordingly to the relieving officer of that parish. The letter is shown to Dr. Campbell, who, of his own

knowledge, tells this Mr. Maclaren she is their parishioner. Her claim is not admitted. The destitute widow is driven across Scotland to Aberdeen. The Aberdeen management tell her she must go back to Glasgow. To Glasgow she goes, with her five children, under ten years old; is refused all assistance, takes shelter with them in the night asylum, catches the typhus fever, and dies in the Glasgow infirmary. The child at her breast was affected; the children were taken to Mr. Maclaren's office, who sends them to this den of Andrew Leech's. So end the labours of the merchant's widow to provide for her children; and such was her death-bed prospect for the baby at her breast, and the four other little ones. Nor can ignorance be pleaded. The superintendent knew the widow's claim. He also knew the place to which the orphans were sent.

"When you were inspecting-surgeon of the district, did you ever make a representation to the managers of the Barony parish with regard to the state of those houses?—I made a representation in June, 1841, to Mr. Maclaren.

"And was any attention paid to it?—None."

Indeed he knew it before the representation, for the evidence contains this closing statement: "*The factor* (steward) of Leech's house is Mr. Maclaren, *the Superintendent*."

A strange and dreadful abuse was discovered in Glasgow by the Commissioners,—a practice of sending parish lunatics secretly to the Isle of Arran, where Dr. Hutcheson found 123 of these wretched beings, of whom he gives this account:—

"Enough was ascertained to convince me that the individuals who undertake the care and management of paupers of unsound mind in Arran are, with very few exceptions, ignorant, poor, and quite unfit for the task,—that many of them are on the verge of pauperism,—that instead of endeavouring to find employment where their labour would be rewarded, they are induced to remain on the island, and rear families, in the hope of saving from the board of patients enough to support their own existence, and thus tending to increase ultimately the pauperism of the district; that the paupers of unsound mind, detained in Arran, are wretchedly fed, their diet being in general the refuse of the potato crop and buttermilk—ill clad, miserably lodged, and subjected to neglect and ill usage; that the medical attendance is merely nominal; that even in severe bodily affliction, they seldom receive any medical aid, many dying without any attempt being made to alleviate their sufferings.

"So quietly, however, has the business been managed, that not only the sheriff and other authorities of the district were ignorant of it, but the Duke of Hamilton's factor, who is resident on the island, was wholly unaware of there being more than a few imbeciles boarded in the district. . . .

"It has been said that incurable lunatic and fatuous patients are happier when allowed to spend their time reclining on the green

sward, amid beautiful and romantic scenery, than if shut up in a gloomy madhouse. But it must be remembered that, in this climate, the winter is long and inclement; that the lunatic so situated has no shelter but a wretched hovel, and that beauty or grandeur of scenery will not compensate for physical suffering. The happiness of the patients is not the object which the parish authorities are anxious to secure when they remove their pauper lunatics to the hovels of Arran, and other similar places. The true motive is economy, and *that is avowed by the more honest among them.*"

It is needless to enter into the details of Dr. Hutcheson's inquiry, as the system, which was directly contrary to law, has been broken up in the Isle of Arran.

Proceeding northward of Edinburgh and Glasgow, we find an intermediate country between them and the Highlands, in which there are fewer parishes legally assessed to the poor, while in many a voluntary assessment is raised in aid of the contributions at the church door. The allowances to old people are about one shilling weekly. Great distress appears to have arisen in many parts by the abolition of small farms called crofts; and in others the bothy system is complained of. This kind of bothy is a place, we believe, in which the ploughmen on large farms are lodged, while their wives and children remain in a distant town. The deserted wives are provided for little better than widows: and Chartism is also said to prevail in these bothies. For this intermediate country we may take the opinion of Mr. Gladstone, father of the cabinet minister, since he is a native Scotchman of strong mind, with views enlarged by his pursuits, and by his residence in England. He lives near Laureneckirk, on the east coast, and gives this plain opinion:—

"Voluntary contributions are precarious, and not to be depended upon. One man gives, and another withholds, and the burden is not imposed equally. The state of society requires that the poor, who have been hitherto indifferently provided for in this country, should be better supported. *The poor in England*, in which he has resided much, *are like princes when compared with the poor in Scotland.* The spirit of independence, which has been said to prevail in Scotland, is of great value; but it must yield to distress; and when people fall into distress they must be supported, and it is only by an assessment that it can be done with good and equal effect."

This is a straightforward statement, embracing the pith of the matter, and befitting the honourable person who makes it.

Before we leave the subject, however, we must advert to an act of oppression discovered by one of the commissioners in a corner of Argyleshire, a parish called Campbelton, containing 9,629 inhabitants. The session-clerk of Campbelton states that the usual rate of allowance to an old person past work is 1s. per week; that he thinks the allowances should be nearly double



what they are, but that the principle upon which the heritors act is to give merely what is enough to keep soul and body together. The late minister states that it is difficult for the poor to obtain even this wretched pittance, because one of the heritors holds seventeen proxies of small feuars, by means of which he swamps the votes of the elders. Such was the poor-roll of Campbelton; but even the fortunate paupers landed upon this roll were not safe, for the session-clerk tells us "that about a twelvemonth ago the roll was *purged*." How was this done?—a resolution was carried, to the effect that "every allowance should be withdrawn from those who are in the practice of begging, and that the allowance should be increased to such of the poor as are more destitute and unable to beg." The monthly committee were further instructed to give badges to those they struck off, "entitling them to beg in the parish." Let us see how the monthly committee of Campbelton go to work. The pretext of this change is, that the paupers of good character should receive fuller pay, when the beggars had been cast upon their own resources. We turn to the evidence, and find that

*"At a subsequent meeting of the monthly committee, forty-eight individuals were struck off the roll, and were offered badges. Very few of them accepted, and during the following winter there was great distress amongst these people in consequence; and, at the same time, those who were suffered to remain on the roll received no additions to their allowances."*

Thus, in the face of the resolution, the heritor with seventeen proxies pockets his share of the forty-eight allowances which had been promised to the other paupers left on the roll. Those other paupers were, therefore, clearly defrauded, nay, their allowances were rather diminished, as we learn from another heritor, who denies that an increase had been promised, though the promise forms part of the resolution itself:—

*"There was no understanding, at the time when the fifty were struck off, that the allowances of the remaining poor were to be increased; on the contrary, they were rather diminished."*

But let us follow the paupers struck off the roll. Mr. Stewart, chamberlain, that is, land-agent to the Duke of Argyll, gives the following confused evidence:—

*"The committee considered that they could not be in absolute want when they had only to apply for the badge, and go round and ask for relief. Witness considers that those persons who received badges were better off than if they had been continued on the poor's roll. The possession of a badge is considered by the beggars themselves as an humbling one, and the badge as a mark of inferiority."*

It so happens that the commissioner visited some of these poor persons receiving "a mark of inferiority," which was to render them, according to Mr. Stewart, "better off" than if they had been continued upon the roll. Let us hear the commissioner's account of the state in which he found them:—

"Janet Sheddan, aged sixty-seven. Was never married, and never knew what a father was, and her mother died when she was eleven years of age. She can't say she ever knew her brothers and sisters, and the nearest friend she has in the world is a cousin. She has had no support from her infancy, and has no person she can expect assistance from. She used to get 2s. in the fortnight, but was struck off the roll in August last year. She was offered a badge, but she refused it. She said that if any one wished to help her, they would do it without a badge. She never went to a door to ask for anything. It was against her nature to do so. She has 1s. a month from the relief-church, and 1s. 6d. after the sacrament. She got 1s. 6d. yesterday from the relief-church, and she got some coals; and she is thankful for them. Pays for a very poor house 35s. There is no chimney in the house, and the wind and rain come down the hole above the fire, and the rain runs over the floor. She gets a little pig, and gets potatoe-peelings and other things from the neighbours; and sometimes she can buy 1½d. worth of meat for it. She gets a little bedding, from a wellwisher amongst the neighbours, for the pig, and she generally sells it to pay the rent; and when the rent is paid, she gets on as well as she can,—at peace till rent time comes round again. Very respectable in her appearance, and the house is as clean and decent as such a house can be made. She has got a sprained hand, and can't do any work. Bed and bed-clothes. Through the dead of winter she lived by working nets, by which she earned about 1s. in the fortnight; and now she does the best she can by working the 'steek' of a stocking. She has been very infirm for five years. She was never able to go out to the street or to church. She got a heavy course of mercury to carry off internal disease. She was then attended by Dr. M'Nab."

Janet Sheddan could hardly avail herself of the chamberlain's badge. Let us look for another:—

"Widow Halford, aged ninety, in the receipt of 1s. a week. She was feeble in her limbs, and could not go about. She had been struck off the roll, but had been afterwards put on again when she fell ill. She goes about the streets with a stick. Both she and Widow Nowlan (former case) were stated to live by begging."

A widow at ninety cannot do much for herself even in begging. Let us visit a third:—

"Chirsty Macdonald, a widow, one of those put off the roll, aged sixty-four. House a small miserable room upon the ground floor. No bed. A little straw in a corner. One blanket and coverlet. Blanket very ragged. Her furniture was roused after her husband's

death fourteen years ago, and has had none since. She has one box, two pots, one of them broken, an old watering pan, and a frying-pan. Some herrings and a small cod lying on the floor. She has a badge, *but she gets very little when she goes out.* She is not able to go to the country now. She is troubled, and in bad health. No seat in the house but a stone. Rent 1*l.* The ladies' society allowed her 1*s.* 6*d.* in the fortnight, which was sent her in bread; but she requested the money might be kept in order to pay her rent. That is the way her rent is paid. She has five children—four girls and one boy.”

This poor woman has made the best of her badge, but it has not succeeded. Indeed, we find one of the heritors stating that the people of Campbelton “dislike both to have to give to beggars and to be assessed.” Let us try a fourth:—

“George Nowland. He was between forty and fifty. He had 9*d.* a week, but was struck off the roll. There were four young children in the room with him. His wife went about with a basket. He had fever and ague in America, and his appearance was that of a man much wasted, and in the last stage of consumption. The house was very dirty, and extremely wretched. There was scarcely any furniture in the room but two bedsteads, which were covered with filthy rags. His rent was 1*l.* 16*s.*, which he said he had always paid.”

We need enter but one more abode of misery.

“Widow M'Queen, past seventy-three. Has one son in the low country, who has a large family of seven children. He is a sailor. Her husband and eldest son were drowned together, and another son has since been drowned. She has no one to help her, except good people in the neighbourhood. Her rent is 1*l.*, and she is bound to keep up the house, but she cannot pay the rent. The house is small, but very respectable in appearance; it is clean and comfortably furnished. The session gave her 1*s.* 6*d.* in the fortnight. They put her off the roll in August last, and offered her a badge, but she could not walk with a badge. If she had got her allowance from the session continued, she meant to have laid up 1*s.* for her rent, and got through with other things the best way she could. She was never in arrear with her rent before.

“*N.B.*—Those individuals turned off the roll in August, 1842, that have been seen by the commissioner, are now supported chiefly by two or three charitable individuals known to him.”

We may now quit this scene of stingy pettifogging, and turn our view northwards, to the Highlands, putting aside the excitement of grouse-shooting, the beauty of scenery, the recollections of feudal tyranny, or of undying loyalty—leaving even our Walter Scott on its shelf; but endeavouring to fix our eye steadily on the human beings to whom all the associations of a passing traveller's mind are unknown, while the daily life among these desolate moors, as behind other scenery, is a bitter and

weary reality. Many of the witnesses at Edinburgh had prepared us for what we should find, stating that a great change for the worse had taken place, even of late years, in the management of Highland property, so far, at least, as the poor were concerned. Their statement is confirmed by the evidence taken in the Highlands themselves; but, instead of endeavouring to condense that evidence, we will give the clear statement of a gentleman resident in the country, who, from his connexions, which are Whig, cannot be supposed to be biassed in favour of poor-law extravagance, and who, for his ability, character, and local knowledge, well deserves respectful attention. This witness is the younger Mr. Ellice, member for St. Andrew's.

"I believe you reside a portion of the year in a part of Inverness-shire?—At Glenquoich, in the West Highlands,—upper part of Glengarry.

"How long have you resided there?—My father purchased it four years ago; since then I have had the control of it, and resided there. Previously I had been residing for three or four months of the year in Badenoch for seven or eight years.

"Have you turned your attention to the state of the poor while you have been residing in the highlands of Scotland?—Yes.

"Have you found in general that they were ill off in point of circumstances?—Very ill off; indeed, extremely so, in many instances in the several districts I have knowledge of.

"I presume there are no assessments in the parishes with which you are acquainted?—No.

"How are the poor maintained?—Only by collections at the church doors, which are entirely insufficient for the purpose. I may mention, that on my first coming to the property in Glengarry, I received a letter from the minister, giving me notice of a meeting of the kirk-session for the purpose of distributing poor's relief, and calling my attention to the fact, that their funds merely consisted of collections at the church-door; that for several years he had been unable to obtain a meeting of heritors; and that the utmost they were able to divide amongst the impotent poor, had been about 3*s.* 6*d.* a-head for the whole year."

Thus we have arrived at the longest period of reckoning applicable to the span of human life, while the miserable delusion of a payment remains fixed at about the support of a single week. Mr. Ellice afterwards gives his general view of the Highland poor, being called upon so to do by the Commissioners.

"Is there anything you would wish to suggest to the Commission in regard to our inquiry?—I may state that I did not expect to be called on to give evidence, and I have had little time to arrange my ideas, so as to give them to the Commission in a connected form. I have, however, noted a few points, which seem to me to be the most important, with reference to the subject of their inquiry. It appears

to me that, irrespective of the partial pauperism that must exist in all populations and all countries, one great cause of that permanent destitution so peculiar to the highlands of Scotland is to be ascribed to the want of any means of steady and industrious employment; and the principal cause may be traced to their almost total want of education, which unfits them for employment in more civilized parts of the country. I ground this opinion partly upon that of many persons, who, from a long and intimate acquaintance with the highlands, are well qualified to arrive at a correct conclusion, and partly upon what I have myself observed in two separate parts of the country, where the greatest difference exists in the tenure of land and the means of employment. I resided for a considerable period of time in Badenoch, in the centre of Inverness-shire, and, comparing the condition of the population there with that on the west coast, within my knowledge, which consists of the district I spoke of, and a portion of Skye, which I visited two or three times to see the state of the population, I consider that the people in Badenoch are, comparatively speaking, comfortably off. The tenure of land in Badenoch on leases is totally different from that in the west-coast highlands. The people in Badenoch have the means of employing themselves in agriculture; and although, in some instances, farms have been extended, small ones having been united and made into larger farms, still the small-farm system continues to prevail, while emigration has kept pace with any decrease that has taken place in the number of farms. The farms in that part of the country are very small in comparison with the large farms in the west, so much so, that rent varies from 20*l.* to 200*l.*, while some part of the holdings, being always under cultivation, gives employment to a number of persons; and I have always seen that in those farms—from ten to forty acres of arable land, with a portion of hill—a man has been able to find the means of sending his children to school, and bringing them up to industrious habits. . . . In the west the population has been apparently, from all that I can gather, *turned adrift*, as it were. Since the introduction of the sheep-farming system the land has become more valuable to the proprietors, when it is turned into sheep-walks, and, in order to effect this, the people have been herded to the shores of the lochs, to clear the valleys which they were in the habit of cultivating. The people have since existed in the miserable villages at the sides of the lochs, almost entirely dependent on their fishing, and a cow's grass, perhaps, and a patch of ground for potatoes. They have no other possible means of subsistence. From all I have been able to learn, I consider *that the condition of the poorer classes in the highlands has been deteriorated very much in proportion as the value of land has been increased by the change in the system of farming.* I am not aware of any exertion having been made in the cases of those estates which have been turned into large farms, to improve the condition of the people, or even to avert the evil consequent upon their being turned out. . . . To show the increase in the value of highland property within the last half century, I may refer to the case of Glengarry, including the property upon which I reside. It is stated in the parliamentary reports on the highlands, that, in 1788, the whole rental of this extensive district was only

800*l.* It is now, to my knowledge, 7000*l.* But the consequence of this increase of value has been the depopulation of the country. In this instance, fortunately, the people were generally possessed of the means of emigrating; and the prosperous and important county of Glengarry, in Canada, was the result. Now, all that remains of one of the most numerous and powerful clans in the north of Scotland, consists of a few sheep-farmers, and an indigent remnant who inhabit some wretched hovels near the canal. There are also minor causes, which, at particular times, render the condition of the poor still more miserable. I refer to the failure of the herring fishing, or of the potato crop. There is the greatest risk of the latter misfortune, from their ignorance of the proper mode of cultivating the plant. They could raise as good crops in the west highlands as anywhere, if they were instructed in the art of draining, and so on. With regard to the fishing, not only might the herring fishing be pursued with vigour, but the white fishing might be carried on with the greatest possible success, and to almost any extent, if the people were trained to it: the abundance of the kinds of fish fit for salting, ling and cod, is beyond all belief. . . . I have stated, now, my opinion as to the main causes of the permanent disadvantages under which the highland population labour. Those which are the more casual, but which are, nevertheless, the more pressing for immediate attention, are the providing means for affording relief at extraordinary times of distress, or in extreme cases of destitution—and medical aid in cases of disease and sickness. The nearest doctor to the district lives fifty miles off, at Fort-William. I do not think there is one in Glenelg, or any at all to the westward of Glenquoich, on the main land."

After this clear statement, a question of the commissioners elicits from the witness the description of a scene deeply appalling, but which, as we must not forget, was enacted by living souls.

"Are you aware that Lord Ward employs a medical person for the use of the population on his estates?—I am not aware of this. There was some talk of establishing one at Fort-Augustus, about thirty miles from where I live. I may instance a case of extreme necessity that came under my own knowledge four years ago. On my way to Fort-Augustus, I passed by a hovel, near which there was half a dozen people on a knoll. I inquired the reason of their being there, and was told that there were five or six children in the house, with a father and mother who had died of typhus fever two or three days before. The eldest girl was only fifteen years of age. None of the people would go into the house from fear of the typhus fever; and the poor children were left to lay out the bodies of their parents and put them in their coffins without any assistance. I was told that two of the children had been seized with the fever and were dying. I sent a doctor immediately from Fort-Augustus to the place; and he informed me afterwards, that by the administration of simple remedies the children had recovered. I apprehend that, if proper means had been taken, the parents might have been saved too."



Yet the Report of the Commissioners, which Mr. Twisleton refused to sign, contains the following sentence—" *It cannot, however, be said, that in point of fact the poor suffer materially from the want of medical aid.*" Mr. Ellice proceeds to another case, in which medical aid was certainly wanted:—

"I may mention, also, the case of a woman who was supposed to be dying in childbed. If we had not happened to be near the spot, and sent for assistance, I believe she must have perished too. In connexion with this part of the subject, I may mention that the means of decent interment are frequently wanting. I have been more than once applied to to give a few boards for the purpose of making coffins. Considering all the circumstances of the case, I am of opinion that, in regard to the casual relief of the poor, a compulsory assessment ought to be resorted to; but for their permanent relief, and to raise them above their present reduced condition, both morally and physically, other means must be resorted to—such as education and encouragement to industry. It is my opinion that the landlords, as a whole, will never give general or sufficient employment to the people till they find it their interest to do so. The large farm-rents are those that are most regularly paid and with the least trouble.

"In what parish were the cases which you have mentioned?—In the parish of Kilmonivaig, on my own property."

Mr. Ellice afterwards gives his opinion plainly on the necessity of an entire change in the treatment of the Highland poor; and though keenly cross-examined by the unwilling commissioners, holds his ground in what follows, like a man who knows he is right:—

"As respects the management of the poor's funds, would you suggest any change in the body whose office it is at present to administer relief?—I am not prepared to do so; but I am satisfied that there ought to be a change. In regard to relief, the people should have an appeal to parties totally unconnected with the district. There are just three classes in the highlands—the landlords, the tenants, and the poor. The tenants and landlords may be regarded as one and the same, so far as regards the poor; for the tenants would not resist the landlords. I do not think that relief will be fairly and justly given to the poor, unless by parties totally unconnected with the parish. The tenants and landlords have the same story to tell, and they are used to the old system of *giving nothing at all*. I cannot conceive that, in justice to the poor, the relief afforded should be confined solely to the impotent, but that all who, through no fault of their own, are destitute of the means of existence, should be entitled to relief; but this is an individual opinion.

"Are you of opinion that relief should be given to able-bodied persons who are out of employment?—So far as the necessities of life are concerned; because I am aware that able-bodied persons cannot always obtain the means of existence. Another reason why the relief in the west—the district of which I am speaking—should

be managed by parties unconnected with the parish, is, that a large amount of the population are Roman Catholics. Of course, the minister and kirk-session have nothing to do with, and know little of, them. In Kilmonivaig, not one of them is on the roll; *nothing is divided among them* because they do not contribute to the kirk funds; and, in point of number, they must be at least equal to the Protestants.

"Can you suggest any other reasonable mode of giving relief to able-bodied persons, than either granting them relief with work as a condition, or in a workhouse?—No other mode than granting them relief with work. The workhouse system I do not believe to be practicable. When assessments are made, I believe the landlords will find it their interest to supply the poor with work.

"Have you reason to believe that a considerable number of the estates in the highlands are heavily encumbered?—I believe a great number of them are, and that such estates are under the worst care possible; many of them are under trust, the proprietor having little or no interest in them, and managed by some Edinburgh agent, whose object and duty it is to get as much money out of them as he can; but I cannot state particular instances from my own knowledge—I merely mention it as a matter of notoriety.

"Supposing an assessment were imposed, and that the sum required to defray the expenses of such an assessment was considerable, might it not render it impracticable for the landlords to undertake improvements?—*Nothing of that sort has been attempted as yet.*

"Would you contemplate, by the introduction of an assessment, forcing the landlords indirectly to alter their present system?—*I would force them to provide for the poor.* They have increased their rents, and out of that increase they ought to be made to provide for the population which has been deprived of the means of supporting itself.

"In consequence of the throwing small farms into large ones, have any persons been turned off their property within the last three or four years?—Yes. I speak of this as a matter of public notoriety.

"To any extent?—I cannot say to what extent. On the property of Glenquoich, four or five families had been brought in by the previous tenant to improve some land, which, I believe, answered very well; but the next tenant to whom the property was let, threw the whole again under sheep; and they were consequently turned off.

In order to acquaint ourselves with this county of Inverness, we may fairly take the course of the Caledonian canal, which, passing through its centre, unites the two opposite coasts; and if we examine Fort-William, built at its western end, Fort-Augustus standing midway, and the county town Inverness, on the east side, a place with 11,000 inhabitants, it cannot be said that the points of inquiry are chosen arbitrarily. In this large town there is a legal assessment, but the following table shows the rate of allowances paid by the *quarter*:—

			£	s.	d.
2	Paupers, at 3s. a quarter, received . . . . .		0	6	0
79	" 4s. 4d. " . . . . .		17	2	4
79	" 5s. 5d. " . . . . .		21	7	11
146	" 6s. 6d. " . . . . .		47	9	0
104	" 9s. 9d. " . . . . .		50	14	0
84	" 13s. 0d. " . . . . .		54	12	0
2	" 19s. 9d. " . . . . .		1	19	6
Making . . . . .			£193	10	9
13	Orphans and imbecile persons receiving various larger allowances, amounting to . . . . .		17	16	0
Making in all . . . . .			£211	6	9

This table declares almost enough without witnesses, but it may be as well to hear what the physicians say; and first, Dr. Inglis, who has practised in the town thirty-two years.

"Have you been in the habit of visiting the sick poor at their own houses?—Yes.

"Do you find them in a poor state?—Miserable and wretched.

"In want of the actual necessities of life?—Yes. I hold the most overwhelming cause of their misery to be the wretched manner in which they are housed, and the accumulation of filth about them.

"Have you traced any diseases to that source?—Yes. About thirty-five years ago, when little attention, I recollect, was paid to the cleanliness of this town, the typhus fever broke out; and I considered it nearly as fatal as the cholera was when we had the visitation of it.

"Do you consider that the source of that disease arose from the miserable accommodation of the houses of the poor, and the filth about them?—Yes; I am sure of that. In one district of the town, they live in a vortex of filth of the most revolting character."

And Dr. Forbes makes the following answers:—

"Have not the impotent poor of Scotland a right to relief, irrespective of the fact whether there is an assessment or not?—Yes, under the statute; *but we have tried to conceal that from them as much as possible.* But everybody knows that the right exists."

"Have you any suggestions to offer in regard to the subject of our inquiry?—I would say that a much more liberal provision for the poor is necessary than what they are receiving at present, in order to support life in any comfort at all; and I have no doubt whatever, if they were better provided for, that fever and the diseases to which they are so subject,—such as dyspepsia and general debility, dropsy, rheumatism, pulmonary and other diseases resulting from deficient nourishment and clothing, would be less prevalent among them."

The four following cases were visited by the commissioners, and are thus described by themselves:—

"Mrs. M'Kenzie, Theatre Land. Not in; but found her children in the house, seven in number; the eldest twelve, the youngest two. Eldest can sew a little, but cannot get any work. Father left the family sometime ago, and went to America. His wife has heard from him, but he has not remitted any money. House and furniture miserable. Receives 5s. a quarter from the poor's fund.

"John Fraser, Petty Street, aged eighty-four. Bed-ridden for eighteen months. Has no family. Receives occasional allowance from poor funds, and has 3*l.* besides, from a benevolent institution. No bedstead; lies upon the floor, or some wretched bedding. A few old chairs, and other furniture, miserable and dirty in the extreme.

"Catherine Fraser. Unmarried. Above sixty years of age. Long afflicted with an ulcer in her leg, the bones of which have become carious. Cannot work. Has 9*s.* per quarter. Her house not the worst; pays 30*s.* of rent. Has a bedstead and other furniture. Very poor in quality, and very dirty.

"Widow M'Gillivray, aged ninety. Lives with a daughter, who has a family. Pays 20*s.* per annum of rent. Has been bed-ridden for seven years, and is quite helpless. Has two sons living in Inverness, who *give no help to their mother*. Receives 13*s.* a quarter from poor funds—nothing from any other public institution. Daughter makes a little money by spinning hemp. Furniture very indifferent."

Even these miserable allowances have not been paid without reluctance, as is shown by an answer of Dr. Inglis, which deserves the more attention because it states his view of the opposition raised in Scotland, by the landowners, against the introduction of a general assessment.

"The case of the sterile and limited means for support of the poor in a parish applies strongly to this place, because heretofore, and till within the last two years, the great weight of the expense fell on the inhabitants, while the heritors escaped. All they did was to put 2*l.* or 3*l.* in the plate at the quarterly collections. Under any scheme of voluntary contribution, the heritors were always backward, and many of them out of the country. The same thing has been the case generally over the kingdom,—the heritors have hitherto escaped; and now that they are threatened, they make a great clamour about the matter, and *seek to do the thing by voluntary contribution*."

The following answer also shows a large class of poor in Inverness who do not obtain even the pitiable 6*s.* 6*d.* or 9*s.* 9*d.* per quarter, and it shows the effect of the clearance of farms—a general grievance in the Highlands, spoken of under the pleasing name of agricultural improvement, but a very retrograde improvement indeed, since it throws back the poor man's tillage-ground into the wide primeval sheep-pasture. Here we find one of these dispossessed crofters.

"Are there many stranger-poor in Inverness?—A great many of them are people who have been sent away from gentlemen's properties in the country. They may carry on for a short time with the small

means they have; then they fall off, and the Inverness people help them. They get a small allowance from the session after being three or four years in town. Some of them come to the town in bad health. I know an instance of a man who came from Kirkhill with a large family, and was unable to do anything. I was informed that *this man's children were lying on the floor without a blanket*. There are many instances of that in the Merkinch, the lowest part of the town, on the other side of the river."

This abolition of crofts has also indirectly injured the poor by lessening the amount of alms they obtain. So states Dr. Rose, minister of the High Church at Inverness for the last forty-six years, and he explains the effect thus:—

"It might be asked whether their present condition is worse than that of the poor formerly. I would say to a certain extent that it is; because, when there was a number of small farms, which are now thrown into one, the poor used to receive a capful of meal at each farm-house; now, they do not receive more from the large farmer. Indeed, at present, they generally receive a halfpenny rather than meal, and it is little meal that can be got for a halfpenny. Formerly, a poor person would collect more meal in the course of a forenoon, in a district of the parish, than he could now collect in three or four days. Formerly the poor, being natives or aboriginal, and being closely connected with each other by blood relationship, received assistance in meal in this manner even when they did not go from door to door for it."

Let us now, as we proposed, pass along the Caledonian canal south-westward to Fort-Augustus. Here we find a veteran, Captain Spalding, who tells us that he has been resident for twenty-two years in Fort Augustus—that he is not an elder of the Church, he is an Episcopalian; but he has had occasion to pay attention to the state of the poor in the neighbourhood of Fort Augustus. Let us hear his account of the matter, for he seems to speak plainly:—

"The houses of the poor people are, generally speaking, very bad indeed. The half of them do not keep out the rain. He has been obliged himself to have thatch put upon the houses, and to give them blankets, more particularly upon Lord Lovat's property and Abertarff's; and to give them coals in winter, else they would perish. Their bedding is very bad, as bad as anything can be; many of them without bedsteads, lying upon straw or chaff upon the ground, and, what is worse, without blankets, many of them lying upon heather. They often suffer dreadful privations from want of food. The greatest suffering they have is from December to June. They are best off in autumn. Then their own potatoes, which they contrive to plant, are ready, and those who can work get a little employment; but there are a good many who cannot work at all. By these means they get on till the month of December, when their potatoes and funds are exhausted, and their condition becomes dreadful. He attributes this

great destitution in some instances to the efficient members of families having gone to America and Australia, leaving their aged and infirm relatives in this country, and to the natural privations occasioned by the death of parents who have died leaving destitute children. There are none of the proprietors of land resident in the county. Mr. Fraser, of Abertarff, is not resident upon an average above a couple of months in the year, and no other proprietor, large or small, resides at all. That when he made up the last subscription, Abertarff gave him 3*l.*, Lord Lovat gave him 3*l.*, Glenmorrison gave him 3*l.*, he subscribed 3*l.* himself, and he made up the remainder of the sum in small subscriptions."

Well done, gallant barrack-master! thatching Lord Lovat's and Abertarff's cottages for them, and laying down his three pounds with three Highland chieftains. Captain Spalding tell us also, that—

"In the winter season there are a considerable number of able-bodied men out of employment in the district of Fort-Augustus. There are a number of small crofters in the district, from whom the paupers have come. They are in a very poor condition; their houses are shocking. He thinks the condition of the crofters would be improved by giving them waste land to bring in, and thus increase the extent of their crofts. He is decidedly of opinion that it would have that effect, and the crofters have more inclination to occupy themselves in that way than in anything else."

Thus it appears that the state even of the crofters is by no means what it should be, but the scale of living here is so low, that a man is regarded as comfortable because he has something to eat. In looking, too, at the destitute, we can hardly remember the poor. Captain Spalding's opinion, that these poor crofters might be benefited by the addition of waste land to their holdings, is confirmed by Lord Ward's land-agent, Mr. Donald Scott, who says that the condition of the poor might be very much improved by giving them employment. "There is a great quantity of land capable of improvement, and it may be done at a cheap rate."

We may now proceed to Fort-William, on the western side of Inverness-shire. In this village we find absolute want of employment, and the greater part of its inhabitants living upon daily alms. It is fair to state, however, that the destitution of Fort-William is a shade or two worse than in the neighbouring country. But the evidence taken here ranges over a wide country, as will be seen. Mr. Macdonald, a banker, states that he—

"Has resided for the greater part of his life in Fort-William, and is agent for the National Bank there. He was a member of the poor's committee of the church at Fort-William. The allowances given to the poor in Fort-William are very small, the highest not exceeding 12*s.* a year. They had no other funds but the collections, having no



donations. Sir Duncan Cameron might give a donation of 5*l.* a year. That did not come through the committee of management for the poor—it was distributed by Sir Duncan's factor, or the clergyman. That the poor are chiefly maintained by the charity of the inhabitants in the town and country; that is to say, the mendicant poor, who go about once a fortnight collecting what they can; those in the town from the people in the town and its neighbourhood, and those in the country, amongst the farmers and others in the country; but, besides the mendicant poor, there are a great many persons in the village in a state of destitution, who would not beg, and to whom benevolent individuals in the village send relief. There are a great many people in that state of poverty, yet their feelings are such, that they cannot bring themselves to begging. They would rather starve or steal than beg, and he has no doubt but a great many of the petty larcenies here proceed from absolute want. He has seen the dwellings of many of the poor: they are so bad that he can hardly describe them. The poor have suffered terrible privations from want of fuel, particularly this last winter. The poor upon the roll in Fort-William have no land at all, and how they live he really cannot tell."

The houses are described, by another witness, as "very small, made of turf; sometimes a small window, very often no glass in it. They have no proper windows." And another, Mr. Crichton, who has long practised medicine thirty or forty miles round Fort-William, speaks thus of that whole range of country:—

"He finds their dwellings in a very wretched state. They have frequently very little or no bedding: they have no linen. They are naturally of dirty habits, and are frequently in a very filthy state. They suffer for want of provisions sometimes; but he does not know that they are ever in such severe distress as occurs in the low country. They have generally potatoes and meal till the beginning of June, when their store is exhausted, and then they must live upon the charity of their neighbours, amongst the farmers and others."

And Dr. Kennedy, whose "practice extends to a circle round Fort-William of about eighty miles in diameter, as far as Glenmorrison to the east, Strontian and Arisaig on the west and north-west, and to Appin on the south," and who, of course, as he says, has seen a great many houses of the poor in those districts, states that—

"He has been in the houses of the poor upon the roll at the Bridge of Nevis, and those of the paupers in other parts of the country are very much like them. They are generally very badly off for bedding; they have rough bedsteads, with straw or heather to lie upon; their bed-clothes are very poor. He has known some of them suffering severely for want of food at this season of the year. He knew a woman die in the village, about a month or five weeks ago, whose illness, he is sure, was brought on by want of food."

Mr. Macdonald the banker's experience takes a yet wider range, for he states that he—

“Has been all his life connected with the management of highland property, farming very largely himself. Besides, witness was surveyor of taxes for the western district of Inverness-shire, and also for the north-western district of Argyllshire, including Moidart, Arisaig, Glenelg, Skye, Mull, Morven, and Lorn; and in that capacity he had occasion to visit all the houses in the district; and although the cottages did not fall under his department, yet he had an opportunity of seeing the whole country, and frequently went into the cottages. The pauper cottages in those countries seemed very like the cottages here. In Kilmuir and Trotternish, they were very much the same as the cottages here. In the island of Egg they were particularly bad. In Kilfinichan and the Ross of Mull, they were most miserably wretched.”

But Mr. Macdonald mentions one bright exception to all this squalid pauperism,—for such we must call it, though Scotchmen confine the word *pauper* to persons receiving adequate food from an English parish. His account of the Ardgour estate, the property of Mr. M'Lean, is a pleasant one:—

“The crofters are in better condition there than those in any place he knows, as far as he can judge from appearances; and he has no doubt it is the case. The crofters have good houses, their portions of land are in good order, and they have constant employment from Mr. M'Lean. He knows no one who pays such attention to the condition of the crofters as Mr. M'Lean. He has no doubt that, by the same attention, the condition of the people might be raised in other parts of the district. The difficulty then would be to dispose of the surplus population. *Somehow or another, Mr. M'Lean's estate is not over-peopled.* The way in which Mr. M'Lean has improved the condition of the people is by giving them pieces of waste-land to bring in, and affording them facilities for doing so. The witness went down this day-week as one of the judges of the Highland Society, to inspect the cottages of those competing for the prizes given by the Highland Society to persons keeping the neatest cottages and gardens in the Ardgour district, and paying a rent not exceeding 5*l.* The judges had the greatest gratification in seeing the condition of the houses upon Mr. M'Lean's property. The cottages were in such order that any person might have slept comfortably in them. They did not confine their observations to the competing cottages alone, but looked into other cottages on the same property, and the impression made upon the minds of the judges was, that they would have made the nicest shooting-boxes possible. The rooms were all with wooden floors, and lofted over, with proper ceilings, and furnished with mahogany chests of drawers, an eight-day clock in every cottage they went into, tables and chairs, grates, and proper fire-places, and windows upon hinges, admitting of proper ventilation. The witness attributes the superior condition of the occupiers of these cottages entirely to the continued attention and encouragement of a resident proprietor.”

But, because one proprietor has done his duty, the poor must not be left helpless until other proprietors may do theirs. The Rev. C. Stewart, of Fort-William, justly observes—

“That immediate relief is indispensable for the poor of this place. That he would prefer a voluntary contribution by the heritors, if they would come forward, for he is not blind to the evils of an assessment; but then, judging by past experience, he *cannot rely upon the heritors*, for they have not hitherto come forward as they ought to have done.”

And it appears, further, that the present allowances, such as they are, will be diminished; for the late minister of Kilmalie, the parish to which Fort-William belongs, believes that the collections at the church-doors will now be a mere trifle, as since the late secession very few of the poor people attend the church. He has all his lifetime, upon principle, been opposed to an assessment; but is now convinced that an assessment will be indispensable.

We now arrive in Ross-shire, one of the three northern counties of Scotland; and in this county we find decreasing allowances, though, when allowances are computed by the year, it seems scarce worth while to speak of their amount. Do we find, what the theories of political economy promise, increased wages, later marriages, money laid by to provide for old age, population within the bounds of subsistence, and abundant employment? Let us see; for in Ross-shire we find at work the pure doctrine of non-interference. This county, like Inverness-shire, stretches from sea to sea. On the eastern coast, we hear the following statement from Mr. Wood:—

“I have been twenty-eight years minister of Rosemarkie. There is no assessment in my parish. The funds are managed entirely by the kirk-session. The heritors take no part in the administration. The rate of allowance to an old person past work and not bed-ridden, varies according to the funds which we have in hand. Generally about 4s. or 5s. a-year. *To widows and children, the allowance is scarcely so much.* When persons are bed-ridden, some occasional aid is given in addition. It is difficult to say how the people live upon these allowances. They live in a very miserable way. The paupers live principally upon potatoes,—very rarely on milk. Sometimes they have a bit of fish,—very seldom oatmeal, and the allowance of it very scanty. The paupers manage to subsist upon the allowance by going about the country and getting assistance from those in better circumstances. The very poor do not help each other,—they cannot afford it. One of the principal means of subsistence during three or four months in the summer for the paupers, is gathering shell-fish and dulse on the sea-shore. By shell-fish, I mean crabs, limpets, wilks, &c.”

Such is the state of those who cannot work, but what is the condition of the day-labourer at Rosemarkie:—

"When employed they may get 1s. or 1s. 6d. a day. There were several out of employment during the last winter. It is difficult to say how they managed to subsist. They complained grievously of the situation they were in, and said that they had scarcely a sufficient supply of food. They do not easily get credit with small shopkeepers. They have not generally saved money. They subsisted, I think, on the assistance of their neighbours."

From 6s. to 9s. a week are the wages of Ross-shire, while in Kent, where the poor-rates were highest, the wages were from 12s. to 14s. Let us next hear the Rev. Donald Sage, late minister of Kirkmichael:—

"When the old people are sick, we do not find a doctor for them. There is a doctor at Cromarty, five miles off, and one at Invergordon, three miles. The doctor at Cromarty does not visit the poor on the roll. In fact they receive no medical relief at all. They are generally doctored, if at all, by parish quacks. The people put more confidence in them than in the doctor. When the people are sick we do not give them extra food, but we give them a few shillings. We have about sixty on the roll. I cannot say with certainty that the children are vaccinated. There was a strong prejudice against it some time ago; to the best of my knowledge they are not—the quacks were against it. There is a great deal of begging in my parish. Those who do beg are the best supported, and the most comfortable among the poor. Every one at whose door they call gives them something, either a halfpenny or a little meal. We have a number of beggars from other parishes. The people *complain of beggars*, particularly those from other parishes, as a burden on them. Beggars from other parishes are generally old people, unable to work."

Let us now turn to the west coast of Ross-shire. Here we find some excellent witnesses, and, as our task draws to its close, we shall extract from their evidence at some length, our object being not to amuse a listless hour, but to show the details of misery which at this hour exists in Great Britain, with a view to their remedy; to prove also how little the assumed laws of political economy are borne out by the facts of man's life. The Rev. James Russell, who has been minister of Gairloch for the last forty-one years, says:—

"Our usual allowance to paupers on the roll is, in ordinary years, from 4s. to 5s. a-year; when the seasons are unfavourable, so as to affect the collections, our allowance must be diminished in proportion: in such seasons it will not exceed 2s. 6d. We have four cases of bed-ridden persons on the roll at present. The first is that of a woman unmarried, upwards of seventy years of age. She lives in a bothy by herself, and is cared for chiefly by a widowed sister, who resides in the immediate neighbourhood. She is supported by the charity of her neighbours. She can do nothing for herself, and her sister can contribute nothing but attendance. Her allowance from the session is 4s. a-year. The next case is also that of an unmarried woman, like-

wise aged upwards of seventy years. She too, *lives in a bothy by herself*. The neighbours look in upon her *occasionally*, but she has no relation to take care of her, nor does the kirk-session pay any person for attending upon her. She is likewise dependent for support on the charity of the neighbourhood. Her allowance from the session is 4s. a-year. The third case is that of a young girl, about twenty-five years of age. Her leg was fractured upwards of ten years ago, and she has never been able to do more than sit up in bed since. She lives with a widowed mother, who has several other grown-up children alive, but none of them residing with her. The mother is unable to work, and *no assistance is received from the other members of the family*. Both mother and daughter are entirely dependent on charity. The allowance for this case is 4s. a-year, the same as before. The fourth case is likewise that of a young woman, aged about thirty. She has been sickly from childhood, and for the last twenty years mostly confined to bed. She lives with a relative, who takes care of her, but who is unable to contribute anything to her maintenance. She is supported, as the others, by the charity of her neighbours. Her allowance is the usual sum of 4s. a-year : on some *extraordinary occasions she has received as much as 5s. a-year*."

Mr. Russell proceeds to give an account of some blind persons in his parish :—

"We have three cases of blind persons on the roll. The first is that of a woman unmarried, aged about seventy. She lives in a bothy by herself ; no person is appointed to take care of her. The children of the neighbours look in upon her, and do any little thing for her that may be necessary. She is dependent entirely upon charity. Her allowance is, as usual, 4s. a-year. The second case is that of a man, the brother of the former, who is upwards of eighty years of age. He lives with a widowed daughter, whose husband was drowned about two years ago, and left her with a family of four young children. He has no family, with the exception of this daughter, who can do nothing for his support. The most that she can do is to keep him clean. He is dependent entirely on charity. He has the usual pittance of 4s. from the kirk-session. The third case is that of an old man, upwards of eighty. He lives with his wife, who is about sixty years of age. They have one daughter, about twelve years' old. He has no resource but the charity of his neighbours. He is for the most part confined to the house, but his wife begs for him. His allowance is 4s. a-year."

The minister then details the cases of his insane parishioners, of which we will quote one, or rather two :—

"The next two cases are the cases of two unmarried men, which are very much alike. They are aged each about fifty—they *live in huts by themselves*—a sister occasionally looks after one of them, but the other *has no person to do anything for him*. They wander about the country, and are supported by begging. Each receives from the session 4s. a-year."

Thus it appears, that in Gairloch, not only aged widows, but the blind, and not only the blind, but the insane, may live in huts by themselves, with none to look after them, and receive four shillings a-year. Still Mr. Russell says, that their population is redundant, and that "marriages take place at a very early age." There is also a parish called Poolewe, subordinate to this parish of Gairloch. Poolewe contains 2,331 souls, its poor-roll has sixty names on it, and the sum divided in 1842 was eleven pounds. The innkeeper of Poolewe says:—

"Generally during the summer months, before the potatoes are fit for use, the poor suffer very great hardships, their supply of provisions during that season being very precarious. They are likewise very ill off for clothing. I have seen several of them literally covered with rags. Indeed, I should think a stranger could not pass through the country without being struck with the ragged and tattered appearance of the generality of our paupers."

Yet, he adds:—

"I consider that pauperism has been much increased among us, and that the circumstances of a large proportion of the working classes have been greatly deteriorated by the contraction of *early marriages*. It is quite a common thing for parties to marry at a very early period of life, before they have made any provision for a family, and to build a cottage for themselves on a lot of land rented by the parents of one or other of the parties."

It may be said that the distress on this western coast arises from the loss of the manufacture of kelp. In Poolewe the distress has been heightened, no doubt, by that loss. But the innkeeper, after speaking of the days when the kelp manufacture existed, adds these words,—*"I ought to mention, however, that the rents were then much lower than they now are. In some instances the rent has increased in a five-fold, or even six-fold ratio."* At all events we find the same misery at Ullapool, on the west coast of Ross-shire, where the kelp manufacture was in its best times quite insignificant. At Ullapool, we will call but two more witnesses respecting Ross-shire. Alex. M'Kenzie, Esq., says:—

"I am a fish-curer in Ullapool. I have been so for the last thirty-five years. Begging is incessant—not daily but hourly; at certain seasons, however, particularly from the latter months of spring till the time when the potatoes are ready for use, the supply arising from this source is often very limited and precarious. During this season the wants of the poor are often very ill supplied—I have known cases of extreme destitution among them. *Often when sitting down to my own meals, I have felt that I was scarcely at liberty to partake of them, while conscious to myself that many around me were almost in circumstances of starvation.*"



The population of Ullapool is 2,780; the roll contains eighty names; the sum distributed is *ten pounds*, being half-a-crown for each person yearly. The Rev. Alex. Ross, who has been for fourteen years minister of Ullapool, says:—

"The poor here live principally by begging. They beg daily; and if it were not for this resource, it would be quite impossible for them to subsist. They are very miserably off here. They are ill-provided with food and clothing, and they make constant applications to me to help them. It is impossible for me to witness their distress, and let it go wholly unrelieved; hence I spend a considerable part of my income in giving them assistance in money and in meal. This habit of begging has a demoralizing tendency—it leads to a great deal of imposition; and we can hardly trust what the beggars say to us. The relieving them is a heavy burden to persons with limited means; and there is always an uncertainty as to what they may receive from others."

Yet it is pretended that immunity from parochial assistance secures manliness of character. The minister's income, too, it should be observed, is taxed at Ullapool instead of the land. We must allow the kind-hearted minister of Ullapool to tell one or two of the *owre* true tales of his parish.

"We have likewise on our roll a bed-ridden woman, who is also blind. She is the wife of an old man who was formerly a labourer, but who is now almost bed-ridden himself. He has no land. He receives for himself and wife 4*s.* a year. They are maintained entirely by their neighbours. Of course the 4*s.* which we give is hardly worth speaking of."

This payment of four shillings yearly to a blind woman bed-ridden, and to her husband almost bed-ridden, is, we suppose, the lowest payment to old age in Scotland. Mr. Ross also speaks of widows with young children: he says—

"We have three cases on our roll of widows with young children. One has five or six young children. Her husband was a tailor, who died last winter, leaving his family very destitute. She retains for the present year about half an acre of land, which will be worked by her neighbours for her. She cannot work much, as she has an infant at the breast not above two months' old. She subsists almost wholly by the charity of her neighbours, including those who are in somewhat better circumstances. The eldest boy will shortly be sent to school; and he will, at my request, be taught gratis by the schoolmaster. The widow will receive 4*s.* a year."

From helpless age, and almost helpless widowhood, he passes to two helpless orphans, one an idiot: who we might hope would receive more than four shillings a year. They belong to a family of six children whose history is worth tracing.

"The other two orphans on our roll are brother and sister. The brother is about thirteen years of age, and the sister, who is an idiot,

is about sixteen years of age. They receive between them 4s. a year. They are two out of a family of six orphans, all of whom originally received relief from us. Their father was a labourer, who died accidentally at sea, about ten years ago. All the children have lived with an elder sister, who was about eighteen or nineteen years of age when the family were left orphans. She has been their principal support, and has gone about from house to house collecting money, meal, potatoes, and fish for them. The case excited much sympathy. She did not work much, as the family required part of her attention; but she spent her time principally in going about the country making collections for her brothers and sisters. She was not very anxious about sending them to school, but such of them as did go to school had their education gratis."

Still four shillings a year. There is one case, however, in which the parish of Ullapool pays five shillings. "We defray," says Mr. Ross, "part of the funeral expenses of deceased paupers. We allow in such cases five shillings, which will help to pay for the coffin. *The friends of the deceased person dig the graves themselves.*" So the earth closes, and the weary are at rest even in Ullapool.

Quitting Ross-shire, we are now arrived at the northern coast of Scotland, in the great county of Sutherland, which, large as it is, belongs almost to one individual. Formerly it was the property of two persons, but the larger part was always owned by the noble family which bears its title. This county has been the subject of an experiment by which all its inhabitants were cleared from their small inland farms, and transplanted to the sea-coast, in the hope of their becoming fishermen. The experiment, which promised well, yet caused deep sorrow, does not appear to have succeeded; nor is the poverty of the people effectually remedied even by the great liberality of him who has since come into possession. The Rev. H. McKenzie, who has had the care of the small seaport of Tongue since 1806, remembers the first of these clearances. It was made on the smaller property.

"I remember very well the change which took place under Lord Reay, in removing them from the interior *and from every good spot of land*, and transplanting them to barren tracts of land along the sea-shore. The change took place here in 1806, when I was first inducted to this parish; but I had been born in the parish, and knew it as a child, for my father was minister of the parish before from the year 1769. He died in 1834. I am very positive, and have not the slightest doubt, that the condition of the people has been very much deteriorated by the change. There is more money going about us now, but there is much more poverty, and not the same substantial comforts as formerly. It is true that, when they were in the interior, they were very badly off in seasons when their cattle died. They used to subsist principally upon flesh, fish, milk, butter, and curds and cream. They used to eat no vegetables. They had a few spots of oats and

bear, but they bought very little meal. Potatoes were only introduced when I was a child, and now it is their general food. In the years of distress they were thrown upon the resources of the proprietor; and I remember an instance of this kind in 1783, when the proprietor was asked to supply meal to the people, when he made an appeal to government on the subject, which was responded to. He, and all the tacksmen, contributed in part; and the government afforded assistance in peasemeal, which was distributed by the kirk-session. However, these years of distress were by no means of frequent occurrence; and they have, in fact, been *much more frequent since the change*. I consider that the frequency of the periods of distress under the old system has been very much exaggerated, and has been made improperly an excuse for the change."

Another witness states, that at one of these periods, 1837, the late Duchess-countess distributed meal, potatoes, and money, to the value of about 1,050*l*. Yet the minister of Farr is equally decided as to the ill effect of the change. Speaking of the larger part of the county, he says:—

"I remember very well the change which took place in removing the small tenants from the interior to the sea-shore. In my opinion the people have been decidedly losers by the change. They cannot command the same amount of the comforts of life as they did formerly. Their condition has been deteriorated both in food and in clothing. They used to keep many cattle, and they had *an excellent supply of milk and of butcher meat*. They likewise manufactured their own clothing, and they were far better supplied with bedding and clothing than they are now. These are facts to my certain knowledge. I came to live in the parish in 1813, and I have resided there ever since the first partial change took place in 1814; the second and more important change took place in 1818, and the alteration was completed in 1819. I am certain, from my own personal observation, that the food and clothing of the small tenants is more scanty than formerly. Their lodgings are certainly improved."

Such was the former diet of Sutherland. The present subsistence is thus described by the Rev. C. Gordon, minister of Assynt, a parish of 3,177 persons, with a yearly poor-fund of 12*l*. 6*s*.

"For paupers, and all cottars in general, the principal food is potatoes and herrings. Their lodgings are wretched. The cottages are generally built of stone and turf mixed; the roof is always turf, with a covering of heather. Those recently built have a lining of clay, and sometimes lime, in the inside. The old cottages have nothing but the bare earth for a floor; indeed, there are very few now which have any thing else for a floor. The cottages have generally no chimneys; they have merely a hole in the middle—sometimes, however, at the end. There has been a decided improvement in those cottages which have been recently built."

One more witness will be sufficient—a farmer of the last-mentioned parish, occupying one-third of it, a large farmer certainly, for he holds 30,000 acres in sheep pasture, from which the crofters had been transplanted to a less kindly site; but a very fair and liberal witness—David Macdonald, of Lochinver.—

“I am a resident tacksman at Lochinver, and have been so for twenty-five years. I have a farm of 30,000 acres—one-third of the parish of Assynt. The whole is a pasture-farm. In addition to farming, I have likewise salmon fishing about 100 miles along the sea-coast, and employ, in connexion with it, between 200 and 300 people. I have likewise to do with shipping, but this is solely in consequence of my salmon fishings. In this way I have had various opportunities of becoming acquainted with the condition of the working classes in this district; and I am likewise generally acquainted with the condition of the paupers who receive relief from the kirk-session. I consider that the poor on the kirk-session roll are in a most miserably destitute state. They are wholly depending on the contributions of their neighbours. *I cannot say that there are many supported by their relations*, at least in my immediate neighbourhood: there are several old women who live by themselves, and who subsist almost entirely on the charity of their neighbours. The highest allowance, within my knowledge, given to paupers on the roll, is about 3s 6d. a year. The old women, whom I have spoken of, have generally small huts, which have no furniture in them. They are, for the most part, water-tight. The paupers are very deficient in bed-clothing: in fact, some of them have no bed-clothing at all. Their usual food is potatoes, and occasionally salt herrings. They have no milk. They likewise eat shell-fish, such as mussels and cockles. They go round to their neighbours and acquaintances once a year, to collect meal and potatoes, fish, and other articles. This they call “thigging,”—they do not admit that it is begging . . . I would most undoubtedly recommend the levying of an assessment for the support of the aged and infirm poor,—that is, for the same class of persons who at present receive relief from the kirk-session. I think that this would have the effect of freeing them from dependence on the uncertain and precarious relief which they obtain at present by going about. I think that at present they are not adequately provided for, and that many receive nothing at present who are equally needy with those who are on the roll. I would willingly bear my share of an assessment raised under proper regulations for their relief, and I should much prefer it to the present mode of supporting them.”

The opinion of this last witness in favour of a compulsory assessment carries great weight. Having now reached the northern point of Scotland, we may return by the large islands which adjoin its western coast; and may first land in Lewis, an island about sixty miles long, at its chief town Stornoway, a parish with 4559 inhabitants, 214 paupers, and a poor-fund of 30*l.* 15*s.* The Rev. John Cameron, who has been minister of Stornoway

for eighteen years, says, that "the poor are daily in his kitchen begging; that old Lord Seaforth gave 20*l.* to the poor, but for the last seven years nothing has been given from the estate; though some of the crofts are given for nothing, but they are not worth sixpence an acre. It is the practice," he says, "when sons and daughters are married, for their parents to give all up to them, and they are supported by them as long as they have the power of doing so, but when these die, or lose the power of supporting them, the parents then fall on the township."

Thomas Knox, Esq., agent for Mr. Stewart Mackenzie, Seaforth, says that he "scarcely ever turned his attention to the poor on the roll, but left the management to the minister and kirk-session; but believes those he visited with the commissioners a fair specimen of their situation generally in Lewis." The account of these visits we shall see presently. Mr. Allan Ross, schoolmaster, says that "the bothies of the poor are not worse than the houses of the crofters, with the exception of thatch. They have not straw to thatch them, and none of them are water-proof. The crofters' houses are generally water-tight during winter. They put the roots of the barley on their houses in autumn. In spring they take off the inside of the thatch, which is full of soot" (because the houses have no chimneys,) "and apply it to manure potatoes, give a partial thatching with the outer thatch above the fire, and take the whole of the thatch above the cattle-end of the house" (for the crofters and their animals live under the same roof) "to make manure. Towards the latter end of summer and beginning of autumn, some of the poor often *live a month and six weeks entirely on shell-fish*: this consists with his own knowledge. They live on mussels, cockles, limpets, and wilks." We must add the evidence of Mr. Miller, the surgeon of Stornoway, for the surgeons and ministers in the Highlands do the duties of landed proprietors.

"This has been a very good year. Fewer poor than usual. His wife, who is a stranger to the parish, and only came to reside in it last year, was remarking to-day how different their numbers were this year and last, and expressing her fear that the poor had heard of her complaining of the number who came to be served last year. The houses of the crofters are very nasty. When he goes a long journey to visit patients, although there are no inns, he could not think of putting up in any of the crofters' houses. He must make for a clergyman's house or for home. Paupers' houses still worse than crofters'. Great want of bedding, particularly in Barvas. He is the only surgeon who goes into the country in the island. The poor in Barvas are worse off than in Lochs. In Lochs they have fish—in Barvas none. *Labour very cheap, from ninepence to a shilling the day, without food.*"

We will now give the Commissioner's account of some of the houses he visited:—

"Isobel Macleod, piper's widow. Two pigs tethered in one end of the house: three children in the other, eldest twelve years old. In the inner room bedstead, straw, and blankets. Water coming through the roof.

"Eric Smith, Malcolm Matheson's widow, aged eighty. Her son, who is a crofter, gives her a bed. In this house there was a sick boy lying on straw in one part of the outer-room, and in the other end of it they were making compost with sea-ware.

"Eric Smith, Malcolm Matheson's widow, aged ninety. Very poor house,—poor bedstead, straw, and blankets, two chests. Hardly able to crawl. What she gets must be brought to her. It is said her family *should* support her.

"Kenneth Smith, labourer. Received supply from the session for a sick child. Most miserable house. A hole in one end of the roof. A wife and six children. Horse in one end of the house. A little straw and blankets,—no other bed in the house. Eldest son eighteen or nineteen, works with his father.

"Annabella Macleod. Afflicted with epilepsy. Fell in the fire, and was dreadfully burned. Her allowance is 1s. per week, and it requires three pounds of fresh butter to dress her sores. *Her allowance is not sufficient to provide ointment.* Lives with Murdoch Smith's widow, who is also on the roll, and who has one child, two or three years old. House very bad. Macleod is a shocking spectacle.

"Lewis Macdonald and Catherine Macdonald, seventy and eighty. Lodge in a wretched hovel. Said to have a son in the service of Captain Oliver's revenue cutter, who *ought* to support them.

"Archy Kennedy's widow, aged seventy. Not at home. Good house once; now no windows in it; boards instead of windows. It is said she has sons who *ought* to support her.

"The houses visited were, with a few exceptions, exceedingly dirty; nearly all of those in the country having byres, or places for preparing compost in the end of them, *into which was thrown the filth of the house.* Several of the crofters' houses were also visited; and in point of bedding and cleanliness, they appeared very little better than those of the paupers."

It is observed in three of these cases that the poor people *ought* to be supported by their children. It is much more certain, however, that the parish *ought* to do something for them in the meanwhile.

Returning southwards we pass the island of North Uist, where Lord Macdonald, at his own expense, is employing a great number of people in making roads and in draining their own crofts; which his factor says "makes them very happy, as they are very willing to work,"—and we land in South Uist. Population 7,329: *no poor roll kept.* Here Mr. Maclelan, a tacksman, says that:—

"The crofters or cottars have nothing but straw on their beds,—at this time it is very scanty. He cannot say as to their bed-clothes, he thinks they are very scarce with them. He believes them to be very badly off in that respect. Their children are clothed with pieces of



blankets, which they make themselves, and which they call 'kelt.' The crofters themselves are clothed in the same way. Many of them are in rags. Some of the crofters get a little crop off their ground, but it does not serve them; and they are obliged to beg to make up the difference. There are a great many poor widows amongst them, and a great many infirm old men. He never knew himself of any relief being given by the session to poor people. The people in the parish *marry very early.*"

The schoolmaster of Dalibrog knows one family, who for fourteen or fifteen years have not lain in a bed—they just lie on the floor round the fire; and he understands there are others in the same situation. Mr. Chisholm, Roman Catholic clergyman of the island, gives the following account of the distress of the people, which he shows to be increasing, and assigns the causes:

"Has been clergyman in South Uist since October, 1819. Has had plenty of opportunities of becoming acquainted with the poor of his congregation by visiting them in their houses. There are many of the cottars who have no means of living at all, except what they get from their neighbours. The cottars have no land attached to their houses; crofters have some land, and in that they are distinguished from the cottars, who have none. He has found several of the cottars dependent upon charity, without bedding or bed-clothes; and he must say the same with regard to many of the crofters. Straw is the only substitute for a bed, and that often in pallets on the floor. Their children are next to naked, and the parents are little better than the children. Some of the children often have not even a small flannel waistcoat or shirt entire. Has frequently known many of them reduced to extremities for want of food. Witness's charge only extends to the Water of Hobarg, being about fifteen miles from Lochboisdale to the north, and it also extends to the end of the parish on the south. He may say that the condition of the poor is the same throughout the whole of his charge. There may be some parts where the distress is severer than in others; but he scarcely knows how to single them out. He may say generally that the people living in the hilly part, and amongst the lochs towards the south end, are the worst off. The poor receive no assistance from any fund belonging to the parish or the kirk-session thereof; there is no fund whatever. He believes that over the whole parish of South Uist, the Roman Catholic population amounts to 5000, and the Protestants to 2000. There are no means for affording medical assistance to the paupers; the medical men discharge their duties towards them the same as he does—from charity. The maintenance of the poor, by voluntary charity, falls much heavier on the parish now than ever he saw it before. The time was when the crofters killed a good many sheep; but it is different now, though they still sometimes kill one or two in a season. When he came here first, the crofters used a good deal of animal food,—a great deal more than what they do now. He attributes the deterioration of the situation of the crofters to a number of small farms being thrown into large ones, and the former holders of them being thrown a burden on the community; and hence, the poor press more upon those living by their own means than formerly. Some of the cottars to whom he

alluded as having no means of employment, were able bodied men. That he has not considered how these persons might be employed; u t he thinks the proprietor might find ways and means of employing bjem. The destruction of the kelp trade has been a great cause of the increase of pauperism; and if no substitute is found for it, the whole population will be paupers. *Fifty crofts at the very least have been thrown into large farms, and all the families who dwell upon them have fallen for support upon the community, except a very few who have emigrated.*"

Adjoining South Uist is the isle of Barra, with 2,352 inhabitants and no poor roll. A bequest of 400*l.* has been made to the poor, but the interest has long ceased to be paid. Some of the poor have lately gone to America—one to New Zealand, where he will not have found life more savage than in his original island, as the following visits of the commissioners show:—

"Ban M'Dougall and wife. The husband is now begging in Tiree. There are three children at home, and one with the father. They have as much land as the other crofters, but could not plant it, not having the means of buying potato-seed. Are in arrears to the tacksman. *Children starving and all but naked.* There is one bedstead without any bedclothes. Got a stone of meal out of the provisions given from the subscription. The house, if possible, worse than any we have seen. Husband only fifty: the wife forty. The man *does nothing but beg or gather shell-fish.* Cannot fish, never having been taught to do so.

"Daniell M'Dougall. Four children and wife. *Children nearly naked.* Very wretched bed. One broken jug, one pot, one small tub.

"These people have no employment, and the crofters complain that they are eaten up by the poor.

"Widow Catherine McNeill, about fifty. Furniture—a wretched bedstead, without bedding, spinning wheel, two chests, a bowl, a jug, and a small iron pot. Has no children. Lives alone. Gains her livelihood by begging, but does not leave the island for that purpose. Has never left it at all. House exceedingly wretched. *Has nothing that deserves the name of a door; no window; no chimney.*

"Widow Cumming, about fifty. Has no bed but a temporary one, —meaning by that some straw, or other bedding, laid upon the floor. Has four children—the eldest a girl about twenty, and the youngest twelve. Has no means of subsistence but what she and her children can gather. *They live chiefly on shell-fish,* but get a little potatoe-ground here and there from their kind neighbours. Have no furniture except two or three chests of different sizes. One of the worst-conditioned houses we saw."

We may now transfer this painful inquiry to the isle of Skye, which is larger than the county of East Lothian, and lies so near to the mainland of Inverness-shire, that from one side of the ferry a man may be heard calling for a boat from the other. Mr. Kennedy, schoolmaster of Snizort, gives this account of it:—

"He never knew what poverty was till he came into Skye. He had previously no notion that such destitution existed in Scotland.

He is very well acquainted with the situation of the poor immediately around him; within a space of three square miles, intimately; and generally, even beyond that. He knows families, consisting of five and six individuals, who do not consume half a boll of meal in the whole year. The poor beg. There were three or four of them at his house yesterday. They get a little bit of ground from their neighbours, upon which they plant potatoes; and in order to make manure for them, they dig holes in the ground, and put heather into them to be rotted; and they also straw their houses with heather, from their fire to the floor, to be decomposed by their treading on it, and make up a kind of compost at the end of the house. All the end of the house farthest from the fire is full of it. They turn it out once a year. The potatoes raised with this manure is their chief support.

"Their houses are most wretched huts. Very few have bedsteads. They have shake-downs, made of heather, next the floor, and a little straw above it. They are very ill supplied with bed-clothes. Many of them sleep in their wearing clothes. Is satisfied they suffer much from cold and want of proper food. He has known their privations bring disease upon them, particularly flatulence of the stomach and watery stomachs. They throw up water from the stomach; and on this account they smoke a great deal of tobacco, which is reckoned a cure for the complaint, which he is satisfied arises from potato diet.

"Mr. Macdonald manages the whole of his property, except Skibost, where he lives, in the lotting way, and many of the boys coming from other parts of it are as poor as those already mentioned. All these lots are let at rack-rent. Mr. Macdonald is contractor for most of the parliamentary and some of the parish roads in the island. His crofters work upon them, and pay their rent in labour. He allows each man a stone of meal a week for subsistence, which is only sufficient for himself, and leaves nothing for his family. The lands of Raza, in this parish, are also very high rented. They were high enough formerly, but now, being all let to a tacksman, he has raised the rents upon his tenants and crofters; and, next to Bernisdale, they are the poorest in the parish. No management can make the rents out of either of them."

One would suppose that the witnesses were speaking of Tipperary, not Inverness-shire; and for tacksman one might read middleman. But there are other points of resemblance in the management of Highland property, as it is described by Mr. Martin, minister of Duirnish, who says, that there "is no parish in which the poor are in a more distressed state. The system adopted here has been ruinous to the poor. Two systems have been pursued; one has been to subdivide the crofts. He has no right to inquire into people's motives, but it has been supposed by some that this has been done for the purpose of increasing the nominal rental,—the effect of it has been to reduce the people to poverty, more families being placed upon the land than it can maintain. Another system has been to throw the farms into sheep walks, and remove the crofters, without providing any place for them on which to settle. This has been equally productive of poverty. The improvements at present carried

on in the highlands in general, and in this parish in particular, are confined very much to the farms of the proprietors themselves. The small tenants have no encouragement to improve."

Here again one might suppose that the witness was speaking before Lord Devon's Commission. The difference between the West Highlands and Ireland evidently consists in the discourses, not the dealings, of the oppressor—in the patience, not the sufferings, of the oppressed.

These small tenants, indeed, are, many of them, in the condition of paupers, if any distinction of the kind can be drawn in this part of Inverness-shire. Two surgeons, witnesses, agree as to the diet of both. Dr. McLeod says, "that some of the paupers live for part of the year upon shell-fish, and go great distances to get them. The poorer crofters are, in many cases, reduced to live for part of the year, in the summer time, on the same food:" and Mr. Mathison, surgeon in Portree, adds, "that he has seen frequently diseases brought on among the poor for want of proper food, particularly dyspepsia and skin diseases." Here we cannot but quote from the *Encyclopædia*, published at Edinburgh, a passage which shows how little is known in that university of the real state of the Scotch people. Under the article "Skye," we find these words: "the people never wear shoes and stockings before the age of eight or ten: they keep their feet always wet: they lie on beds of straw or heath, *which last is an excellent restorative: they eat heartily of fish, but seldom regale themselves with fresh meat.*" Compare this flourish of the Edinburgh Professor with the Commissioner's account of his visits in parishes of Skye. Here is a visit in Borge:—

"John McGinnes, cottar.—House and bit of ground. Wife and three children. Had shell-fish and bread last night. *Had nothing to-day but shell-fish.* Have got some shell-fish for dinner to-day, chiefly mussels. Herself and husband gathered them yesterday. He has no work whatever just now. They have no potatoes. One little basin of meal, *which she keeps for her youngest child.* One bedstead, straw, and very poor bed-clothes. Three children sleep upon straw on the earthen floor, with one poor blanket over them. They have done what they can to make the house comfortable, by putting up a mat between the door and the fire-place. *Outside the mat, and outside the door, covered with heather for making manure.*"

Here is another in the same parish of Borge:—

"Catherine Macdonald.—Does not know her age. She is in bad health. Not one article of furniture in the house. Neither pot, pan, nor dish of any kind. House very small, and made of turf,—straw in one corner of it with rags for bed-clothes. Roof made of turf, with very little thatch on one corner of it. So full of smoke and so offensive, that it was not possible to stand in it. Has nothing to live on but shell-fish, and what she can get from any of the neighbours."

Here is the house of an Inverness-shire cottar, with a small croft:—

"John Macrimmon, cottar.—Outer partition, wood; inner, stone. No cow. In outer room a bed; in inner room a dresser and plenty of crockery, large trunk, three stools, and straw chair. Bed in inner room; no window. Wife and six children. Rent 3*l.* 10*s.* Can plant from three to four barrels of potatoes, and sow a barrel of corn. Pays his rent both in money and labour on the roads. Has no stock of any kind. None of the children are at school. Girl eleven years old—was at school, but he could not afford to keep her there. She was at the Gaelic school. Eldest son thirty-one; out, doing for himself. *Croft only maintains the family a quarter of a year.* Begs the rest of the year from his neighbours. They have nothing but shell-fish at present. People now go twice a day to get shell-fish, winkles, mussels, and cockles. No crabs or lobsters. If he had the means of getting a boat, he would get his family through by killing fish. Has been here for six years. He came from Macleod's estate. He was a grass-keeper there, and was better used there than here. The croft where he was grass-keeper was thrown into a large farm."

Here is a sick labourer, with a wife and six children:—

"Alexander Macdermott, aged fifty.—Has no land. Can work a little; but his health not good. Wife and six children. Children pretty nearly naked. No bedsteads. *Scarcely any straw on the floor in the sleeping apartment, and what there is, has the appearance of having been long used;* and there is nothing on it but a few ragged bed-clothes. His own clothes are rags. Division from compost heap only half high. Division from sleeping-place four boards. All his furniture, a board supported upon stones, a stone seat, one pot, one basin, a plate and a-half. He gets ground for potatoes, which keep him till May, or thereabout. After that he has only what little fish he can catch, and shell-fish, to live on. Has no boat or long lines; what he catches is with a rod and line off a rock. Has not had any meal or potatoes this week. His own potatoes were done at May. This family seems in the lowest state of indigence. No parish aid."

And here, lastly, is a deserted wife, sitting in an empty house:—

"Rachel Beaton.—Deserted by her husband, Robert Alexander, who is a Glasgow man. Was born in this parish, and returned here, thinking her friends could do something for her, but found *they were* not in such good circumstances as she expected. She got leave to go into an empty house from Mr. Macdonald's factor. *Has two children of her own, and three orphan children of her brother.* They are at present living in the empty house—nothing in it but a few poor body-clothes. Has been here *ten months.* She was married in 1837, and remained with her husband in Glasgow till she came here. She came here from being out of work. She lived in the town's parish in Glasgow, and sat in Dr. Norman Macleod's church; but she thinks their house was in the college parish. Has no notion where her husband has gone to. Has been begging through the country, and *has not even straw to lie upon.* Has one old blanket a woman gave her."

In this case we may study how the doctrine of sympathy works. Rachel Beaton is deserted by her husband at Glasgow—

receives no help there for herself or her two children—returns, like Naomi, to her home in Inverness-shire, bringing with her three orphans of her brother, (the principle works in Rachel Beaton,)—finds that her relations are too poor to help her—obtains from the laird's steward, for her double family, leave to sit—not to sit, but to lie down on the floor of an empty house;—here the sympathy acts, though weakly—does not obtain from him straw to lie upon—the principle is exhausted in this quarter—does obtain, (one must hope, during the winter, for she had been there ten months) an old blanket from a woman, who can ill spare it, most likely, herself, but with whom this principle of sympathy works. This principle of sympathy seems a very fickle one for destitute women or children to build upon, and, worse than uncertainty, it appears most active in the hearts of those who have nothing to give.

Surely here the rich might venture to mitigate at least the *effluxes* of the poor. There is another danger, too, apprehended in Scotland from an increase of allowances—the diminution of rich men's liberality. It is expressed in the cant phrase of “drying up the sources of private charity.” But in Skye this danger cannot be dreaded, for the rock has not been yet struck, and the waters have not begun to flow.

Let it not be said that this misery arises on the west coast of Scotland from a cause beyond control—the loss of the kelp works: we have shown, even there, other and stronger causes which can be controlled, and will now call a witness, who was accidentally passed by at Dingwall, on the eastern coast of the Highlands, the Rev. Duncan Campbell, minister of Kiltearn, near Dingwall, who says:—“My predecessor was twenty-five years minister of the parish. I have read a passage in the Statistical Account of Kiltearn, written by him in 1839, in which he states that ‘the miserable pittance allowed to the poor on the roll is totally inadequate to the relief of their distress, and that the greatest misery and want prevail in consequence, to an extent that would seem incredible to those who have not actually witnessed them, and that it is no uncommon thing for an unmarried female or lonely widow, who has survived all her friends, to live in a wretched hovel without fire, or bed-clothes, or food, in the depths of winter.’ I have seen a few instances of distress in the parish which correspond with that representation.”

Many instances could hardly be expected. Here is one, however, found by the Commissioners:—

“Jane Munro, about seventy, *had been blind twenty years*. Received 9s. a year. Paid no rent, her house being a wretched hovel, without a chimney, and dilapidated. The roof was of turf, thatched with broom, but not water-tight. *The snow came in upon her last winter*. She lived alone, and no one took charge of her. In a previous winter, her clothes had caught fire, and she had been very



severely burned—so much so; that it was thought for some weeks that she could not recover. A small subscription, amounting to 20s., was raised to get her clothes. The neighbours were in the habit of carrying water for her, and making the fire. She had nothing to depend on except casual charity. The daughter of a neighbouring farmer was in the house at the time of the visit, and stated that she had come in the morning, and found the old woman's meal-chest literally empty. Janet Munro was very grateful for the least trifle. She had no relations but a brother, who was old and feeble like herself. Her only amusement was feeding chickens. The case was altogether one of extreme wretchedness, and inadequately provided for."

Here is another, in the neighbourhood, at Dingwall—Christian Gray's:—

"Christian Gray, aged forty-five, in the receipt of 6s. a year: rent 28s. She lived in a hovel with no chimney. Not quite sound in mind, but a hard-working, well-meaning person, who supported for fourteen years her father, who was long confined to bed. She looked pale and worn. Her neighbour, Mrs. Maclellan, wife of Mr. Maclellan, tailor, said that Christian Gray was frequently in great want, although willing to work. Her health was broken. Mr. Maclellan had known her as a girl, and spoke highly of her respectability and good conduct. They occasionally give her a little meal, when they think she has nothing to eat; but they themselves have six children to support."

Poor Christian Gray, with her poor wits, worked hard for fourteen years to support a bedridden father, is cast forth into a hovel alone, willing to work, but no one hires her; the world gives her six shillings in a year, but she has to pay twenty-eight for her hovel. No wonder that Christian Gray looks pale and wan. Let us go back to Kiltearn, and enter one more hovel with the Commissioners:—

"Mrs. Munro, *not on the roll*, pointed out as a case of severe distress. She had five children, the eldest fourteen, youngest four—the eldest a girl, a 'delicate lassie,' who had tried to work, but it proved too much for her. The two next, who were boys, aged thirteen and eleven, were able to earn something by field labour,—6d. a day, but work not constant. The rent was 2l., but she was not able to pay it. Her husband had been dead about six months. Previous to her marriage, she had been in service in respectable families. Her husband was a cabinetmaker, and lived in the parish. Her house was poorly finished. The roof was of turf, and thatched with broom, and not water-tight. She said, 'I was thrown into this house by my husband's death. The rain comes in in torrents. I used to have a comfortable home. I can now get nothing to do. There is no work to be had, and people *find they have nothing to give.*' The children had been breakfasting on potatoes and milk."

The minister of this wretched parish throws more light upon its general state than we can usually obtain. He says, "that an assessment ought to be introduced; and that if something be not done immediately for the poor, they must starve." He adds:—"The paupers are not in my parish at all sufficiently

maintained by the charity of their neighbours. The people are charitable, but their charity is not sufficient. Were it not for the charity of some of their neighbours, many of the poor must have perished. I am sorry to say the richer part of the inhabitants of the parish are not the most charitable to the poor. There are five heritors, but only one resident. I believe that the principal cause of the poverty of the people is the enlargement of the farms. I believe the rental of the parish is above 5,000*l.*, but I could not exactly say. The church-door collections will be decidedly materially affected by the late secession from the established church. There will not be 2*d.* left for the poor. There are several able-bodied persons in my parish who get only occasional work. There are not very many day-labourers—their wages are 1*s.* 3*d.* a day. I do not know how they manage to shift during the time of the year they have no employment.”

Let us look a little into the circumstances of this parish. The population is 1,436; the sum paid to the poor 20*l.* 4*s.*; and this miserable sum will be put an end to by the secession. What is to be done? It is often argued in Scotland, that an assessment would swallow up the rent. But in Kiltarn, we have got at a rental of more than 5,000*l.* a-year. In the English Union which we took as our standard, the parish most nearly approaching to Kiltarn in population contains rather fewer inhabitants, namely, 1,300. Is the rental swallowed by allowances?—not at all. Though instead of 20*l.*, there were 644*l.* spent last year on the poor, there remained 6,000*l.* for the landowners. Probably 500*l.* would go as far at Kiltarn as 644*l.* in the south. To that amount of two shillings in the pound we would tax its heritors; would take poor old blind Janet Munro out of her hut, find a cottage where she might live with her aged brother, feeding her chickens in the sun, and instead of nine shillings a year, give her five guineas at the very least. Widow Munro, who is not on the roll, must be better lodged and placed on it immediately, unless indeed constant work were found for herself and her two boys; but, at all events, a doctor would visit the “delicate lassie,” for whom he would order mutton and wine at the expense of the heritors.

We have turned back unintentionally from Skye, in order to prove that its wretchedness must not be excused by the loss of the kelp-works; but will now proceed south, and land finally within sixty miles of Glasgow, on the coast of Argyleshire, at Oban. The innkeeper, Mr. Duncan Macarther, gives a pithy account of the poor in this town:—“They are chiefly supported,” he tells us, “by begging: if they were not supported in that way they must starve, as far as I can judge; and I am acquainted with the expense of every article which the poor can require. There are, as it were, three classes of the poor,”—let us mark Boniface’s classification: “those who cannot go about at all; those who can

go about but cannot do any work; and those who can do a little. The first class are kept from actual starvation chiefly by the second class, who beg for them." Here we have the doctrine of sympathy in perfection. The heritors at Oban had just declined an assessment. They leave the beggars to the sympathy of the poor. The poor are too busy or too poor to look after the beggars: so the beggars classify themselves. And the impotent who are bed-ridden, are "kept from actual starvation" by the impotent who can go about. Thus, at the end of our tour, we have got to the bottom of the doctrine of effluxes.

Let us hear how the doctrine works in Oban from Mr. Aldcorn, who has practised medicine there for eighteen years, though he has now given it up. He tells us that there has been a very great change for the worse among the poor of Oban since he first knew them, and thus proceeds:—

"The bed-ridden poor are in a very destitute state in point of diet. The allowance they get from the session cannot be intended to maintain them, it is so perfectly inadequate; and there are very few people in Oban who are able to give in charity, and *still fewer who do give*. The poor who are able to go about have tickets to authorize them to beg; the bed-ridden have also tickets, and they send their tickets round with some of their neighbours, who bring them back what they receive on their account. The witness has taken great pains to ascertain what a person may make by begging in the week, and he has never found any one make 7*d*. Their receipts are generally about 5*d*. It is only on Saturdays that they are authorized to beg by their tickets, when they get half-pence. No person has given them meal for the last two years, as far as witness knows; and the beggars themselves have told him that they never get meal now. They prefer the meal greatly, because it is much more valuable to them."

The surgeon informs us that an assessment had been consented to by the heritors in 1841, but had been discontinued after two years. He is asked apparently for proof that the assessment had been useful, and he gives an awful proof, indeed:—

"As a proof that the poor were better under the assessment than what they were without it, witness may state that after the distribution under the assessment ceased in January 1843, *three-fourths of all the bed-ridden and very destitute paupers died within three or four months of that time*. There was one of them, named Peggy Buchanan, who, previous to the assessment, used to be looked after by her neighbours and acquaintances. She was an exceedingly respectable woman, whom witness had known in better circumstances. The parish authorities did not take care that the poor people who were unable to do for themselves were attended to. They never inquired after them to see what condition they were in. They did nothing for them, but left them entirely to the accidental interference of their neighbours. There was another woman, Effy McCulloch, who lived with a brother, a shoemaker, seventy years of age, almost as poor as herself. She was so poor that *she lay upon the floor on a little straw*

*for thirteen weeks on her death-bed, during which period, being from the time of the stopping of the distribution under the assessment till her death, she received only 2s. 6d. from the parish, as she herself stated to the witness; and the parish refused a coffin for her, though her brother had no means of furnishing it."*

We must enter with the Commissioners one more dwelling, in Kilmore, a part of the same parish as Oban, where we find the widow of a respectable tradesman,

"Widow Fergusson. Husband was a mason. Has four children; oldest seven or eight years old, youngest a posthumous child. She got 5s. after her husband's death, but nothing more till the other day, when she got two stone of meal. *She and her four children have lived during the summer upon half a pound of pease-meal in the day.* She was very ill off. She was thankful now that she got two days' work in washing and ironing. Her husband was a native of Crieff, but had resided as a tradesman twenty years in the parish before his death. Her house is very clean, and there is a great appearance of respectability about it."

In order to see what this ration might be, on which the mason's widow at Kilmore had to feed herself and her four children during the summer of last year, we have weighed out half a pound of pease-meal, which has been boiled, and is now lying before us. Its breadth is somewhat more than that of a common child's bun, though it is twice as thick. A stout man might eat so much peasepudding, with pork, as an appendage to his dinner. The reader may bring this amount of food before his mind, by considering that the eight ounces of pease-flour had to be divided into five parts, and that each part will weigh less than could be carried formerly by post under two franks. The widow had to still the cries of her children by again subdividing for each this scarcely tangible weight into a breakfast, dinner, and supper. She must well understand the last siege of Jerusalem.

We will now call our last witness, the minister of Morven, a pleasant name if poetical recollections did not yield to penury. Mr. Macleod gives this melancholy account of his own neighbourhood.

"There were formerly three or four heritors in the parish. One of them, the Duke of Argyle, was proprietor of a great part of it. His lands were let to substantial tacksmen at moderate rents, and there were, besides, a respectable tenantry, renting farms at a rent from 20% to 30% a year. The tacksmen kept a number of people about them, and when their servants became old, or were in sickness, they provided for them. The general poor were the relations and kins-people of the tenantry or farmers, and they were willing to assist them whenever they were in want. In those times the people had no occasion to apply to the session, and they seldom had any claims made upon them: still they distributed all the money they had, in order to better the situation of the poor. Times have now changed. Great part of the property in the parish has changed owners,—the new

proprieters, wishing to increase their rents, have displaced the tenantry, and introduced a new set of tacksmen at higher rents. The old tenantry have dwindled into day labourers, and being removed from their former possessions, now covered with sheep, have found refuge in the parish and elsewhere. The new tacksmen, though they are very benevolent individuals, from the increase that has been made to the rents to be paid by them, have not the same means of supporting the poor as their predecessors had, nor can they be supposed to take the same interest in them, being strangers to the country. A number of the new proprietors also farming their own lands are non-resident, and do not contribute to the assistance of the poor to the extent that the resident tacksmen did formerly. Thus the sources of private charity are diminished; and the tenantry, who were themselves the supporters of the collections at the church doors, are now in some cases reduced to being a burden upon them, so that, as the number of poor increases, the funds for their support diminish."

Mr. Macleod then states his conviction, that it is now necessary all over the Highlands to raise money for the maintenance of the poor, over and above what is given by private charity and church collections. He states that he has no difficulty with regard to the aged and impotent, but that he has difficulty with regard to the cottars, whom we should call day labourers, and the crofters, who are little above them. Many even of the crofters he thinks worse off than the poor upon the roll, and he says "that there is no class in the Highlands he feels so much for as the poor crofters and cottars. When they were willing to emigrate, they were prevented from doing so by influential proprietors, and by the Highland Society itself, who were afraid that the country would be depopulated. Since that period the country was turned into sheep walks, the kelp manufacture had failed, and the people have no way of living. In his parish they have exemplified the evils of the two systems at once—the depopulating system has gone on upon the one hand, and the subdividing system upon the other. The people have been turned from their possessions on the large farms, which have been thrown into sheep walks, and have been forced to find refuge in the villages on small portions of land incapable of maintaining them and their families. There is no employment for them; and unless employment be found in making roads, improving waste lands, or otherwise, there must be universal pauperism. A highland proprietor who creates a village where the people cannot have the means of living by fishing or other steady employment, is no benefactor to the human race."

We here close these three volumes of evidence. Their contents will surprise Scotchmen who have believed that their parochial system is not only good but a pattern for others. We

will not dwell upon its evils, but merely point out the errors into which the advocates of parochial non-interference have fallen. That doctrine rests partly on political economy, partly on ethics; it has been practised in Scotland. We do not cry down political economy, but only say that its professors have not understood their own science. They tell us, that unless the poor are checked by the pressure of starvation, early marriages will accelerate population: facts prove that destitution breeds recklessness, and recklessness improvident marriages. They say that non-interference produces high wages—the evidence shows no high wages, but some very low wages: that the poor, if unassisted, will provide for their old age—the report shows the old people starving in rags. The ethical part of this hypothesis tells us, that if we withhold all parochial aid from the poor we shall secure their independence of character; but we find them beggars, and their children driven to the streets, where they are trained for the gaol. It tells us that we must not interfere with the sympathies of the poor, but stretches those sympathies to a point at which they must break. We trust that the landowners and citizens of Scotland will see through the philosophy which has blinded them; and that the poor of Scotland will have cause to remember the kind physician Dr. Alison, not only for his earnest endeavours in their behalf, but also for his final success.

---

*The Print Collector: an Introduction to the Knowledge necessary for forming a Collection of Ancient Prints.* London. 1844.

WE almost doubt whether we are not violating the old rule of not reviewing a review, in introducing to the notice of our readers this interesting and amusing book. As an article in a contemporary, it would have acquired that reputation for condensed information and amusement which will perhaps be denied to it in its form as a book. Amongst collectors it will not fail of securing respect and applause, but the world in general will regard it as *caviare*, and neglect its treasures on account of the exclusiveness of its title. We cannot but rejoice that, in this work, one more instance is added to the literary acquirements of the most laborious of professions,—to the possibility of combining the knowledge of the gentleman with that of the professional man.

Of all the taste-manias, that of collecting prints is the most defensible,—the most within the means of the man of moderate income. The most elaborate collection hardly approaches to the expense of a first-class picture: prints require no galleries; a few portfolios—easily moved—easily put away—is the utmost



they demand: and whilst the power of multiplying the same engraving materially adds to the correctness of its value, it does away with the selfishness of being the solitary possessor of this or that article of *certu*. The print, too, is more readily authenticated, and less perfectly forged, than the picture, the statue, or the coin; retouched plates, and repaired impressions abound, but will not for one moment embarrass the judicious collector, unless conceit and self-confidence on his part come to the aid of adroit forgery on the side of his deceiver. Hudson's mishap may perhaps act as a warning:—

"Hudson, the portrait-painter, master of Sir Joshua, was so fortunate as to obtain a fine impression of the very rare etching by Rembrandt, called the 'Coach Landscape.' On occasion of this acquisition, he gave a supper to his amateur friends, at which to display his purchase. Benjamin Wilson, his brother-painter, who had a good judgment in this branch of art, and knew Hudson had very little, though affecting great enthusiasm for it, amused himself at his expense. He etched a plate in the style of Rembrandt, and sent an impression to Paris, circulating a report at home that there had been discovered in France a print, by Rembrandt, hitherto unknown, and apparently a companion to the 'Coach Landscape;' that money had been offered for it for the king's collection, but that the proprietor meant to bring it to England for sale. Hudson, therefore, to anticipate his friends, hastened over to Paris, and bought the print. On his return, he collected all his amateur friends in London to a second supper, given especially for the purpose of receiving their congratulations, which he received accordingly. Very shortly after this, the whole of the same party, and Hudson with them, were invited to a supper at Wilson's. When all were introduced to the supper-table, every plate was found turned down, and on the guests lifting them, behold under every one an impression of the unhappy companion of the 'Coach Landscape;' and under Hudson's plate lay the money that he had paid to Wilson's confederate in Paris for the purchase."—Pp. 7, 8.

It is not always that a person's conceit is rebuked so harmlessly.

Further, very many, if not all educated persons, are pleased with prints,—a pleasure by no means dependent on professional knowledge of their value or their difference. The light of the lamp is as good for their enjoyment, as that of the sun; and the unpretending portfolio is sure of meeting with numerous admirers in the winter's evening circle. And here the print-collector must not plume himself above his picture or coin rival in the more universal nature of the admiration his collection elicits from a mixed company than that of his opponents; he must not mistake pleasure for admiration: he must ever be prepared very often to find a print less thought of by the uninitiated, in consequence of its rarity or importance. If he heightens the excitement, like the conjurer, by previous com-

mendations, like him, he will assuredly disappoint his audience. He produces a first-rate impression of the "Descent from the Cross," and hears some one whisper, "What a great patch that man on the ladder has in his trousers!" He must bear all this. He must bear to hear of his "Fall of Phaeton," that some bystander "does not know what it is, but thinks it seems to be a sad accident." He must bear all this with the same serenity that the lover of nature's gigantic efforts hears some travelling dandy characterise Niagara as "very pretty," or some utilitarian American estimate how many mills its glorious fall would turn.

The determination once come to of forming a collection, however small, the next point is to determine its nature,—whether wood or copper, etchings or finished engravings, or, in these days, mezzotints or lithographs, shall form the staple of the collection. Then comes the question of classification,—a question rather running into the former:—Shall our prints be arranged according to schools, or shall our endeavours be confined to one school? Some persons will classify according to the schools of the painter from whose works the engravings were taken, and place together every plate after Raffaele, or Corregio, or Reynolds; another person follows the schools of the engravers, and his Dutch, his German, his Flemish, his French, and his English prints occupy separate portfolios, whatever their subjects may be. It may be, that the works of those whose prints have had no predecessor on the easel are classed together, or those of such artists as have been their own engravers; thus bringing Martin Schoen, Durer, Rembrandt, Hogarth, and Burnett, into one class. Another collector adheres to dates, and makes a chronological arrangement. Whilst there may be some odd person or another,—we believe one still exists,—who classes his prints as over-officious servants arrange their masters' libraries—by size, quartos with quartos, octavos with octavos, duodecimos with their brethren of the same regimental standard; producing as much confusion in the portfolio as when, on the library shelf, the *Pickwick Papers* gets in between Gibbon and Taylor, or George Herbert is supported on one side by Tom Moore, on the other by a straggling volume of the *Standard Novelists*. In one point of view, the print collection should decidedly differ in arrangement from that of the library: all of one subject matter should not live together. Even the most initiated cannot but get tired of turning over page after page of portraits or landscapes. Variety is decidedly of advantage.

A print should have three qualities, says our author; it should be a good impression, an early impression, and in good condition. Every really good impression must be an early one, but not every early one a good one. When it is borne in mind that not a single impression is taken off without the plate having been previously rubbed by the workman, we may well conceive

how soon the fine lines of a print disappear or become confused. Then comes the necessity of retouching; which, if done by the hand of the original master, will produce a print very difficult of being distinguished from an original impression; but when committed to the hands of new and perhaps less talented workmen, the difference is great, the value much diminished. Countless, almost, are the impressions which an engraver throws off during the progress of his work, varying from the first outlines to the all but completed engraving—the “proof before letters,” as it is technically called. Before prints were made quite so much a matter of trade, these proofs were confined to the few copies the artist worked off just before he placed the title to his work, for the purpose of distribution among such of his friends as might give him the last suggestions of improvements. Now they are mere matter of greater price, and the number is regulated by the number of subscribers.

“Ferdinand Müller, at Dresden, brought home to his employer, Rittner, the publisher, the first proof of his beautiful engraving of the ‘Madonna di S. Sisto.’ The mercantile man shook his head, and told the artist he must go over the whole work again, and retouch it throughout, for that such delicate work would not throw off a sufficient number of impressions to answer the trade purposes. Müller’s remonstrances were vain, and he was compelled to rework his plate: at every touch he felt he was sacrificing genius to gain. He completed the labour imposed upon him, but did not live to see a print taken off. He sunk under the dispiriting task, fell a victim to the vexation, and died, broken-hearted, on the very day, as happened, on which the first proof impression of the retouched plate was rolled off at Paris.”—P. 33.

In some plates the edge, or “burr,” produced by the progress of the dry point through the copper, is characteristic of the early impressions; whilst, in others, the old custom of engravers being their own publishers, and mere publishers not taking to such things until the reputation of the print was established, marks the date and the comparative value of the impression. But a year or two since, the original plates of Hogarth were retouched, and published in London; and some of those of Albert Durer are now undergoing the same process. Both these, however, yield to the “Murder of the Innocents,” by Marc Antonio, after Raffaele, regarded as a mine of study on account of its perfect drawing. This plate, now three hundred and thirty years old, has been retouched from time to time, is now printed from at Rome, and actually let out by the hour to such as wish to take impressions from it. In considering the condition of a print, more points are requisite to be attended to than can be noted at length here: we must refer to our author’s third chapter for all the information on the width of margins, the

beauty or disfigurement of a smear, the deceits of Indian ink washing, or the ingenious forgery of a clever Frenchman, of going over every line of a weak engraving with a hair pencil, so as to render it capable of passing muster as an early and good impression. The "Peintre Graveur," of Bartsh, will prevent many a person from falling a victim to a clever copy. It is the result of the careful and often microscopic examination of the most celebrated prints with their most celebrated copies. The shape of a weathercock, hardly one-twentieth of an inch square, when subjected to the microscope, becomes the distinguishing mark of the true or false print of Albert Durer's "Nativity;" whilst the claw of the lion, when enlarged under the magnifying glass, stamps the authenticity of the "St. Jerome in the Room," by the same master. Counter proofs are another rock ahead of a young collector, but more easily distinguished than copies; as the impression is entirely reversed, the thin paper being placed over an early proof, and then, by subjection to a heavy press, a light impression obtained from the adhesion of the superfluous ink.

As to the price of prints, fashion and scarcity are so dependent on circumstances that no criterion of instruction can be offered: we must gain our knowledge by experience, and generally at a heavy price. The greatest sum ever given for a print was for "The Madonna and Child" of Maso Finiguerra, the reputed inventor of engraving from metallic plates. It was met with accidentally at Rome, by Mr. Ottley, the late curator of prints at the Museum, purchased by him for a mere trifle, sold by him to Sir Mark Sykes for seventy pounds, and bought at that eminent collector's sale for *three hundred guineas*. The "hundred guilder" picture of Rembrandt's, of our Saviour healing the Sick, comes next among the high prices. Eight impressions of the first date of this engraving are known to exist. In 1809, one of these brought within a few shillings of forty guineas at Mr. Hibbert's sale. Thirty years after, the collection of its possessor came to the hammer, and this print was knocked down to a new collector at *two hundred and thirty-one pounds*: in his hands this costly treasure still remains. Rembrandt's "Advocate Tolling" fetched two hundred and twenty pounds in 1835, and his "Coppenol" found a purchaser at three hundred guineas in the same year, in Baron Verstak, the possessor of one of the three copies of the "Hundred Guilder" engraving, as it is called, which may be said to be in the market, the other five being locked up in national collections. But, not to multiply the instances of high-priced prints, let us see what these gems fetched in their author's life-time. Rembrandt's "Madonna and Child" obtained its soubriquet of the Hundred Guilder, because it brought just eight guineas in its artist's life-time. Albert Durer was content to sell his "Adam and Eve"

for four stivers, about eighteen pence; his sixteen prints called the "Little Passion," for two shillings and threepence; and his "Life of the Madonna," his "Apocalypse," and his "Great Passion," for just six shillings for each set of these large woodcuts. The "Eulenspiegel" of Lucas Van Leyden, now worth its fifty pounds, was purchased by Albert Durer, at Brussels, for a stiver, fourpence-halfpenny of our money. The height of the absurdity of the high-priced mania was the scramble for the little sleeping dog of Rembrandt's, which he scratched in a corner of a large copper plate, and the great value of which consisted in his having worked off one impression before he cut the engraved corner out of the larger plate: as unique, it fetched one hundred and twenty pounds.

The custom among the old engravers of working off very many impressions during the progress of their work, each differing in its advance towards completion, was carried, by Rembrandt in particular, to a most ridiculous excess, if we may trust an extract from a catalogue of his works given by our author. Of the engraving of his own portrait, sitting at a table drawing, no less than ten impressions, varying from a slight etching to a retouching, are enumerated. Of these various "states" we are quite as sceptical as our author; accident, a little more pressure, a little more ink, will account for many of these "states." We do not, however, of course, deny the existence of such as are plainly due to the artist's anxiety of revising, very frequently, his work. Catalogues are most learned on these various states, and as comfortably erroneous and amusing as an ignorance of language can make their several compilers. We have some good examples in our author. In the second state of one of Rembrandt's portraits, the "Young Haaring," a curtain-rod is introduced across the window behind the figure. The French catalogue registered this print as "*La Planche Entière, avec la tringle à la fenêtre.*" The English translator converted this into the "The Young Haaring, second state, the plate being entire, with the triangle in the window." Nor was this catalogist content with one such translation. The eighty-second lot of the French catalogue was Rembrandt's "*Ecce Homo.*" An early state of this picture is marked by the position of the lower part of the drapery of one of the figures, with respect to the belt, which is buckled round the waist, sustaining his sword. "*Le bas de la veste de cette figure,*" said the French catalogue, "*dépasse le ceinturon de son épée.*" "The bottom part of the dress," wrote the English catalogist, "of this figure, goes beyond the sword of the *centurion.*" Even the writer in Rees's Cyclopædia, on the German School of Engraving, has followed this example, and converted the "*L'Enfant Prodigue*" of Albert Durer, in some French catalogue, into the "*Infant Prodigy,*" of his article. To travel out of French mis-

translation by the unfortunates of our own nation, let us pass to French translations of their Dutch neighbours. "Met den ezel agter zig," "with his easel behind him," was the correct description in the Dutch catalogue of Amadé de Burgy's collection, of one state of Rembrandt's portrait of the painter, "Asselyn." Ignorant of the print, and not over skilled in the language, the French translator turned to his dictionary, and found "an ass" as well as "an easel" among the meanings of the word "ezel;" knowing, perhaps, more of the one than the other, on the *γνώθι σεαυτὸν* principle, he rendered the passage, "avec l'âne derrière lui." Better than this, and than even Scopoli's dedication of a plate in his "*Deliciæ Horæ*" to Ben White the bookseller, at the Horace's Head, by the words "*Auspiciis Benjamini White et Horatii Head, Bibliopolarum,*" is the story of the real Simon Pure. We give it in the narrator's own words.

"When the inimitable artist of our own time, George Cruikshank, had first attained his celebrity, a publisher of the day, who had employed his brother Robert, a very inferior etcher, took care to omit, in his advertisement, the Christian name, in order that the work might pass off as the work of 'the Cruikshank;' a remonstrance was made, and the Literary Gazette took occasion to warn the public against being misled by this disingenuous artifice; and when that journal next reviewed a work of George Cruikshank, namely, *The Points of Humour*, the reviewer set out thus: 'Assuredly George Cruikshank is the real Simon Pure, he is eminently gifted, &c. A few years after this, Nagler began his Dictionary of Engravers, '*Neuves Allemagne Kunstler Lexicon*;' and meeting with the Literary Gazette, and totally ignorant of the allusion, familiar to English readers only, he construed the soubriquet as conveying an invaluable piece of secret history, and when, in his alphabetical order, he came to our artist, he records him thus: 'Cruikshank, George, a celebrated engraver and designer in London, whose real name is Simon Pure.'"  
—P. 100.

Our author, of course, devotes a chapter to the best way of keeping the collection, which we presume, after the previous advice, the reader has begun to form, and discusses the relative merits of portfolios and Solanders, pasting the upper or the side edges of a print, mounting or backing, and all the other minutiae of preservation. In alluding to the new practice in the French national collection of framing and glazing some of the best specimens, and recommending it for the imitation of our people, our author lets out the secret, that a frame and a glass is as great a protection to an imposition, as it is to a print, and shows the advantages of the old system, by which a print could be thoroughly examined, by a short anecdote. Among the three hundred and sixty-five "*Estampes Exposées*" catalogued by the French collectors, is that of the "*Little la Tombe*," or Christ Preaching, by Rembrandt: an early state of this engraving is



known by the absence of a child's peg-top in one corner, which plaything appears in every later impression. The most careful examination of this print, now framed and glazed in the French collection, will not discover the obnoxious peg-top, or any signs of its ever having been there; but those English connoisseurs who remember the print before it was framed and glazed, and then examined it against the light, are well aware that the restive little peg-top has been ingeniously taken out. This hint must not be lost on our collectors at the Museum: if framed and glazed, let us have none but genuine articles.

The chapter on preservation also furnishes the young collector with the best advice on that very dangerous experiment, "print cleaning;" whilst its successor gives a pleasant summary of the different schools into which engravers are divided, at the same time sufficiently minute to assist the collector in the mode of commencing his collection. The last chapter but one, however, attracts our attention; it discusses the old and the new systems of engraving: by that, meaning not the mere mechanical act, but the system chiefly of patronage and remuneration. The vignette at the head of the chapter is no bad index to the writer's feelings. It represents a placard-bearing Irishman, with kaubeen in his mouth, and his board on his shoulder, the only legible words on which are the Robinsian capitals, ART UNION—TENDERS—ENGRAVING—Possible time—Possible price. It wants no very recondite antiquarian to read these detached capitals into ART UNION of London—TENDERS will be received for ENGRAVING the "Pet Cat" in the shortest *possible time*, and at the lowest *possible price*.

The ancient engraver—and by that we mean, such an ancient engraver whose works command the highest place, without a shadow of doubt—such an engraver was, in very many instances, painter, engraver, printer, and publisher of his print. It was his child that he had nurtured from its earliest birth, and his care of it extended to its latest step towards perfection. If, however, he was but the translator of another's painting, he went not to it as a mechanical work, but, having duly acquired the ground-work of the painter's profession, he intimately acquainted himself with the mind of the painter, realized his idea, and worked under his superintendence. Thus it was that Marc Antonio engraved for Raffaele, and Bolswert for Rubens. Sometimes even he carried out more fully the painter's design. An engraving after a picture may as much amount to an original work as Coleridge's noble translation of the Walenstein.

"As one instance of this, to confine ourselves to one, we may mention the engraving by Agostino Caracci, which is the chef-d'œuvre of that great master's efforts in this line, of the 'Ecstasy of St. Francis,' after Francis Vanni. In this print Agostino has greatly

improved the design of his original. The superior artist possessed himself of the whole idea of the painter; felt what was intended to be expressed, but which appeared inadequately carried out; continued and extended the intention, and perfected what the painter had conceived, but wanted talent to express. 'De sorte,' says Bartsch, 'que cet ouvrage a tout le mérite d'un original.'—P. 168.

Knowledge of effect, and economy of labour, were secrets of the ancient masters of engraving. Spaces of white paper, in their hands, became far more effective than the microscopic tooling and redundancy of labour of the modern artists; a practice ever productive of littleness and finickingness. They now seek to imitate that minuteness of the German school which is not its best quality, and which is more often apologized for, than commended by, real judges. Even with the finishing of the engraving, the work of the ancient artist was not concluded; he selected the paper best suited to his work, inked the plate with his own hands, regulated the press himself, until at length, himself the publisher, the print came before the world the combined work of one master mind.

Alderman Boydell has the discredit of being the introducer in this country of the system of professed dealers in engravings not their own handywork. The Alderman's intentions were good, his liberality to the best engraver of his day, noble; he, therefore, is not to be blamed for consequences he neither contemplated nor foresaw: at the worst, he was but a vain Mæcenas, not a commercial speculator. Now a-days, the print publishers are the incubi of engraving: living on the public taste, and regarding every print as a mere matter of money-making, they pander to the worst taste—the taste of the multitude of the day. They command the public taste, by flattering it; and thus prevent any engraver from venturing his solitary bark without their sanction and patronage, or in the teeth of their faint praise, or determined opposition. Thus, too, they, and not the painter or printer, become the originators of a picture; too often the suggestors of its design and mode of treatment, so as best to secure a handsome list of subscribers. Again: we are very fond of having a good bargain for our money; hence the taste of the day is shown in large showy prints, with plenty of elaborate execution in them, the work of mechanical cleverness, not of genius.

The painting to be engraved once selected, and the engraver put to his task, the whole affair becomes but a mere mercantile speculation on the part of the publisher; hence two results—rapidity of execution, and great depth of cutting. The sooner his capital begins to repay, the better for the publisher. "Be speedy, therefore," is his order to the engraver; "use other and less able hands wherever you can; have recourse even to

machinery in what are now called the unimportant parts; do but produce a good looking plate by the time advertised, and I am content; my subscription-book is full, and I want my money." Hence the engraver becomes a mere operative mechanic of a high class, losing all real love for his art, feeling himself in a degraded position, if possessed of any feelings, and having just as much heart in his work as a maker of pins' heads, or a piecer in a cotton factory.

The next order is, "Let the engraving be strong: I must have proofs—farcical as it may seem—by the hundred, impressions by the thousand." Raimbach's print of Wilkie's "Blind Fiddler" was made to produce five hundred proofs. "This number of proofs," says our author, "would now be considered a very moderate quantity to send out of a readily saleable production." This may be done with impunity with steel plates, but with copper it is perfectly ridiculous. To compensate for the wear of the plate, comes the retouching; and sometimes new proofs, even before letters, make their appearance from the retouched print, by the fraudulent interposition of a piece of paper between the paper and the lettering, or the careful burnishing out of the title and dedication. The print publisher cannot afford to act as Lucas Van Leyden did, and reject every impression, during the working off, that does not arrive at perfection. Both he and his engraver must be content to be far less sensitive of their reputations than those of old.

The modern habits of life, added to the increased minute labour now required in a print, has added another drawback to the progress of modern engraving. In 1785, Woollett received 105*l.* for engraving his "Niobe;" it would now cost a thousand: it then sold for five shillings, it would now cost thirty; and yet, with all the increased expense and multiplied minute work, the engraving by Woollett would be three times as effective as its more elaborate competitor.

It is not, then, from any want of ability in the engravers of this century, that the works of the ancient masters are, or are likely to continue for some time, secure from rivalry in those high qualities of art in which their peculiar excellence consists: it is in the faults of the modern system that we must look for the reason of this fact. On whom, in especial, the system and its faults is chargeable, we will not attempt to determine, beyond remarking, that when the engravers, the print-publishers, and the public, mutually abuse each other as its originators, it strongly reminds us of a certain true but unpolite fable of pots and kettles.

After all, it will be seen that an engraving, at the best, is not an original work of art, except in those few cases where artists are their own engravers. Martin, we believe, scrapes his own plates; but he is nearly, if not quite, alone in this respect, at

least in the British school. There is, however, an engraving which in its complete state is a true work; we mean the wood-cut, if fairly and honestly executed.\* As every body knows, the copper-plate engraving is the engraver's copy, or imitation, by means of his own tool-drawing, of an oil or other painting, about which the only wonder is, that it in any degree conveys, as it often wonderfully does, what we may call the sense, and even more, the feeling, of the original. It is not so with the wood-cut, or rather it ought not to be so. Unless the artist himself draws his design on the block, the wood-cut is, in our opinion, worthless: except in so far as it amounts to an often clever copy of some drawing on another material, which is just what steel and copper engraving is. Doubtless the wood-draughtsman, or copyist on wood, may often be, and is, a good imitator of his original; but when wood-cutting is so eminently susceptible of the very highest perfection, that is, when it is quite as easy for every impression to be actually *the* work, not the copy of the work, of the original artist, we always regret when the inferior process of copper engraving is pursued in the case of wood. In reductions of old pictures, or parts of pictures, of course, this must be the process,—more or less successful as it may happen—but in *original* designs there should be no copyist, or *middle* man. If the artist himself will draw every line clearly and distinctly on the wooden block, and if the engraver will as fairly and honestly cut line for line and stroke for stroke after the artist, without introducing any nonsense and stippling, as it were, of his own, the effect is as nearly that of an original work in pencil drawing, as can be expected; and the result is something much more real than a copper-plate, which labours, as we have said, under the disadvantages of imitating *impasto* by lines and cross-hatching, canvass by copper, and tone and colour by blacks and whites.

In the golden days of Albert Durer, not only did he draw upon his own blocks, but he cut his own lines afterwards. No artist of the present day does this; nor is it likely, for obvious reasons, that such could ever be a general practice: but the best specimens of recent wood-cuts, such as Mulready's series on the Vicar of Wakefield, and Selous' Illustrations of Sintram, were drawn by the artists respectively on the blocks; and they were, we believe, very honestly and carefully cut. In fact, both artists and wood-engravers, (those wood-cutters, at least, who care more for the reputation of producing really good work, than

---

\* We ought not, however, to omit the process of *etching*, on steel or copper, which gives the direct off-spring of the artist's mind, being done throughout by his own hands. Etching has not the susceptibility of the wood-cut; but, in one particular, it may often surpass it; that is, an artist may draw a good design on a wood-block, and an engraver may quite destroy it by his carelessness or ignorance: not so in etching, where the artist is his own engraver, and renders his own ideas.

possessing an extensive engraving-shop,) are beginning to see this. The former are giving more of their attention to drawing on wood blocks, (a matter which certainly requires some little practice,) so as to fit their designs for accurate engraving; and the latter now know their proper province, viz. to cut the artist's lines one by one (as we have said above,) with the greatest scrupulosity. Engravers who cultivate this line, in which great care and no little talent is required, we need hardly say, must be quite a distinct class from the mass of wood-cutters who work for the cheap books and periodicals of the day. The mere *trade* of engraving, to which these have in a great measure led, is the ruin of English art. The Finden manufactory used to employ hands scraping, scratching, and digging, at flashy steel plates, by the hundred, for the happily extinct annuals; and the Pictorial Times and the Illustrated London News must keep up a sort of carpenter's bench at wood-cutting and hacking. Artists in wood, such as Bewick, we can hardly expect to see again; but it is a noble art, which we deplore to find brought down to a wholesale trade. If we must have cheap blocks by scores and hundreds for such common purposes as we have mentioned, at all events let us also have others which may be executed by a higher class of hands, and have some claims to artistic character, to which we need hardly say the newspaper and cheap periodical cuts have but little pretension. It is as well to mention that much of the effect of a wood-cut depends upon the printer, whose skill in this matter is something better than mechanical.

- 
1. *Church Architecture scripturally considered.* By the Rev. F. CLOSE, M.A. *Perpetual Curate of Cheltenham.* London: Hatchard. 1844.
  2. *Remarks on the Rev. F. CLOSE's Church Architecture.* By the Rev. T. KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M.A. London: Rivington.
  3. *Reply to the Remarks of the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD.* By the Rev. F. CLOSE, &c. London: Hatchard.
  4. *Examination of Mr. CLOSE's Reply.* By the Rev. T. KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M.A. London: Rivington.

THE season had been unusually dry. Save the clear stream which, happily, refreshes our own village, the whole adjoining country was suffering from drought. We were disturbed by the perpetual passage of water-carts from the adjoining hills, where the farmers found it no easy matter to supply their cattle. Turnips failed for want of moisture; hay doubled its price.

The clouds were eagerly watched, on a Sunday morning, by rustics who would compound for the wetting of their best apparel, if their fields might receive a corresponding libation. Our readers, then, may suppose the astonishment of the congregation in one of our country villages, at the following misadventure of the young divine who had lately been appointed their curate. His income, we must observe, was independent of tithes, and his short residence in the country gave him little insight into the circumstances of the people. And his easy, well-fed looks, his perfect content with himself and all his belongings, were not much in unison with the anxious and unsatisfied restlessness which the untoward season had contributed to diffuse over the faces of his auditors. It is easy to imagine how he went through the rest of the service; how he spouted what he thought the fine parts of the prayers; but what is difficult to imagine, is, the consternation of the churchwardens at hearing the prayer for fine weather, and being informed that they were suffering under a plague of rain and waters. It might almost have been thought that our young curate had been living in some lady's flower-garden, where the verdure had been sustained by artificial watering, and knew nothing of the brown and thirsty look of the adjoining meadows.

If churchwardens have their surprises, the clergy are not without theirs. We will take the case of another curate, not the creature of drawing-rooms, but nurtured in a deep love for those ancient institutions in which the youthful minds of the present day hold intercourse with the spirit of antiquity. Fresh from the University, our curate arrives, on a Saturday evening, in the scene of his ministrations. Next morning he approaches a building, whose ancient tower and lofty pinnacles promise to realize all his wishes. But nearer observation tells a different tale. The graceful mullions have been removed to let in light, which the erection of a large gallery made indispensable. The deep valley of the roof has been concealed by the flat ceiling which is drawn across. Nothing appears but the ends of a few corbels, which testify to the solid hammer beams and soaring braces, in which the eyes of our ancestors were wont to delight. Alas! all are gone; an underdrawn roof had been prescribed as a remedy for damp and cold, when the church was opened but once a fortnight. But the remedy has proved by no means successful. Mould and whitewash still struggle in perpetual succession for the mastery. If whitewash has it when the church is done up against the Visitation, the residue of the year is under the dominion of mould. The seats, too, have that hopeless air of meagre discomfort which always belongs to thin unstained deal boxes, whether cracking in the centre aisle, or rotting near the walls. Add to all, a druggist's mortar for the one sacrament, and a kitchen-table for the other; brick floors



full of holes, a torn prayer-book, a tattered surplice, a total absence of hassocks, the space within the rails used as a robing-room, and the altar as a hatstand. No one will be surprised if the manners of the congregation tally, in some sort, with the circumstances of the place. We do not expect to find polished company in a coal-hole; and persons who are content that their parish church should be in such a condition, are little likely to feel to it as towards the house of God. Our young curate is scandalized at such negligence. Next morning, he calls upon the churchwardens: Farmer Diggory talks about the times; his brother warden thinks that something may be done, especially as the parson says he will contribute half his year's salary, provided only the Squire will come down handsomely. To the Squire our young reformer betakes himself. He is ushered into a well-carpeted room, with all the appliances of taste and luxury. The Squire is civil, perhaps even gracious: there is little society in the neighbourhood, and he is glad that his wife, who likes reading religious books, should have some one to talk to. He exhibits the splendid prints of Roberts's Palestine, for which he has just paid a large sum, discourses on the view of his park, its old trees, for which he has a vast affection, the glimpse of the church tower which closes his avenue. This starts our curate: he runs off to the neglected state of the church. "Why really," confesses his host, "something ought to be done. I always told the farmers they should be more liberal. The fact is, I have had such great expenses about my house; but I suppose I must do something." At this moment the lady enters: to her turns the curate, hoping for support. "Does not she think the state of the church to be regretted?" "Indeed it is," she replies. "How does she account for the great neglect of religion among all classes in the parish: the farmers grudging to give a shilling to God's service, and the poor to give an hour?" "What can you expect," she says, "when the principles of our common Protestantism are so forgotten?" Though this last remark does not seem very applicable, yet our young divine hopes she is one of those persons who have, in one way or other, confounded Protestantism with the Church of England. He asks a further explanation. "It all arises, sir, as I am told, from this Puseyism. My cousin, who is drinking the waters at Cheltenham, has just sent me a book which accounts for it. The great thing we have to fear at present is 'the extravagant decoration of churches.'" (*Close*, Pref. iv.) Our curate now sees which way the wind sets, and is just about to show her that the parish-church at ——— is, at all events, not decorated extravagantly, but the Squire, who had been meditating whether he must not put off his new billiard-room till next year, strikes in to her aid. "Indeed, my dear, there is a great deal of truth in that. We must be careful not to unsettle people's minds, at

such a time as this. Another year, perhaps, we may have some of the church windows gothicized, which I own I think much prettier; and we can put new lining and cushions to our own pew and the pulpit; but I am sure it won't do at present; it would drive all the people from church." So the church reformer is bowed out, and the Squire walks off to give directions for his billiard-room.

We have stated what we believe to be the practical effect of Mr. Close's labours; and we maintain that for any earnest-minded man to desire such a result is as unaccountable as to offer up the prayer for dry weather amidst the dusty thirst of a protracted drought.

What! is it not notorious that there are whole counties, in which our ancient churches are more dirty and less furnished than Lord Spencer's pigsties? Has not generation after generation seen them moulder on in forgotten ruin, till they threaten to sink down upon our fathers' tombs? Is not the font the habitual place for keeping rubbish and shavings? Is not a damp, dusty, unpainted barnlike sort of building yearly pronounced by the usual officials to be very fair *for a place of worship*? And this while, not a parsonage but is painted, papered, and carpeted, but has its chimney ornaments, its prints and pictures. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners maintain that it is impossible to build a residence for a parson at less cost than 800*l*. In a dear country it would cost 1000*l*. But what wonderful liberality is it esteemed when a clergyman scrapes together as much as this, and lays it out on the embellishment of the House of God? We have references to the "Coenaculum Sion," the upper chamber where the disciples assembled. Such a chamber was the best commonly which was afforded by a Jewish mansion. But grant it small and paltry, were the disciples men who lived in abundance? Did they inhabit dwellings of cedar? Did their couches glitter with the gold of the Indies? Did the looms of Persia supply their hangings? What afflicts us in the present day, is the strange contrast between our private dwellings and the House of God. Nothing is spared for the one; nothing is thought too paltry for the other. Let us agree that handsome churches are not necessary. Let it be allowed that men can pray in "dens and caves of the earth." Yet is it not hypocrisy to use our wealth for ourselves, and then to plead poverty in God's presence? Suppose our author to induce wealthy men to be more *closehanded* than they are at present, would the penury of their offerings towards the decoration of churches which exist, dispose them to erect new ones? Well does Mr. Arnold observe that "in these days of 'abundance and store,' all the grievous spiritual wants of our teeming population could be supplied with the utmost ease, as far as the necessary *buildings* go, if the hearts of any considerable portion of our countrymen could be stirred

to *any approach* to real self-sacrifice for the purpose of supplying them; nay, there are *individuals*, of whom some ten or twelve could supply them all! And even in the way of making provision for these awful wants, *more will be done* by kindling among us the spirit of Church-building, and inducing the rich to consecrate large portions of their wealth to God's honour, than by any possible subdivision of the sums yet contributed for that purpose!"—*Arnold's Remarks*, p. 38.

We are glad to observe some sense of shame in Mr. Close himself, at the monstrous principles which he originally advocated. He tells us in his Reply, that his main fear arose from the introduction of Popish emblems, and that as to the decoration of churches, his "argument was only against excess." (*Reply*, p. 4.) This of course is a defensible position. Any excess is to be avoided. "Fair weather" is always desirable, but why should such an addition be made to our service in time of drought? Why not rather pray for rain, when we are suffering for want of it. If our churches were extravagantly rich, and our houses mean and comfortless, if men starved the board to build them, if they lay in sackcloth, and decked the altar in gorgeous stuffs, then were the caution needed, that charity begins at home. But is this the case? We mention the last fact which came to our knowledge—what we heard only yesterday—that there is still standing in the western part of — church a stall where the last rector kept his cow. This is worse than what still exists in the adjoining cathedral town, where a church is used as a greenhouse. We take these as the two last things which have come to our ears. Similar cases might, we fear, be found any where. And is it such as we whose danger is superstition?

Our wonder is then that at such a season as the present, an author should arise, who though certainly alluding to Popish emblems, should yet spend at least eighty pages in persuading the people of England that their great danger is from their excessive decoration of churches. We are naturally led to ask what circumstances can account for so singular a hallucination? Where has he been, to understand so little of life? What peculiar prejudices have blinded him? And this question can only be answered by considering what is that especial error which prevents the large party to which Mr. Close belongs from discerning the clear light of Gospel truth. We believe that this, like their other evils, results from their ignorance of the doctrines of grace. They discern not that glorious incorporation into the body of Christ, by means whereof the supernatural privileges of the Holy Ghost are handed down among the sons of men. To them spiritual assistance is a mere dream of fancy, the flickering of private imagination; a mountain torrent which runs noisily for a few hours over its shallow bed; and not that deep and unfailing stream, which having its source in the hill of

God, flows forth in perpetual exuberance to water the land of Zion. In other words, they think of grace as only an individual possession; they look to it as it might be looked to by Jews or Patriarchs. They know not whether in the true Christian sense "there be any Holy Ghost." Hence they regard God's gifts as separate and independent blessings. They know nothing of Christian society. They have no incorporation in the family of God. They are a sort of Christian Troglodites. And being such, no wonder if they view whatever tends to collective worship with suspicion. Who ever heard of erecting a town-hall where there was no corporation? What need of a market-place in a village? So the House of God implies that He has vouchsafed to preside over a peculiar family. In such does He dwell, not in His own proper majesty, but as having revealed Himself as our common Father in Jesus Christ. The real objection, therefore, of Mr. Close and his friends to Church-adornment, is, that it is correlative to Church-union. Those who think it entitled to attention, must needs hold that there is such a thing as the household of Christ, and family of God.

But here we are met by the objection, that all this is true of the ancient worship in the temple of Solomon, but that it is inapplicable to any other system of divine service. Solomon's temple "was indeed a holy place,—and the only one ever thus consecrated to God." (*Close*, p. 38.) Like other Judaizers, Mr. Close gives a reality to the forms of the ancient worship, to which they are as little entitled as our own to the opposite charge of being shadowy and untrue. The Jewish system was, in truth, the shadow: the body is Christ. We almost fancy our author to be a victim to some of those Rabbinical delusions which represent the ancient temple of Solomon to have been perpetually filled with the external marks of the Divine presence, which were occasionally vouchsafed there. Hence that multiplicity of errors which Mr. Arnold exposes in so satisfactory a manner. Mr. Close forgets that God's presence was with the Jews before the erection of Solomon's temple. Those striking Psalms, in which David expresses his sense of the reality of his indwelling in the material sanctuary, he altogether overlooks. One would suppose that, like the German neologists, he denies the existence of Daniel. He forgets that our Lord declares of the second temple, that whoso swore by it swore by Him that dwelt in it. He is at issue with the Homilies, which expressly assert that our "temples and churches" have "as great promises of the presence of God, as ever had Solomon for the material temple which he did build." (*Homily for repairing and keeping clean of Churches; Arnold's Remarks*, p. 22.)

Now, we lay it down as a certain truth, that whatever reverence belonged to sacrifice or temple under the system of the Law, the self-same pertains to them under the dispensation of the

Gospel. This is often lost sight of, because men exalt the Jewish worship into something of that actual being and proper efficacy which nothing earthly can contain. God's presence, it is true, dwelt in the temple. He was served there by the offering of beasts. But had sacrifices such as these any proper efficacy? Could the blood of bulls and of goats take away sin? Did they ought but serve as a connecting link with that real expiation which once, in the end of the world, was made on the altar of the cross? To raise them into an objective and positive efficacy is, no doubt, to exalt them above the rank of Christian offerings. But this is to Judaize as much as the Pharisees of old. Weigh them rightly, and such victims avail no more than the prayers and oblations of Christians. Nor was God more truly present, as the Homilies remind us, than when we meet for our public offerings, and, though but two or three in number, believe Him to be really in the midst.

In all this we never question that there is a difference between the Jewish and Christian service, that God's presence was single and local in the former, while in the latter it is multiplied and Catholic. What we maintain, is only that assertion of the Homilies which Mr. Close denies, that our churches have "as great promises of the presence of God, as ever had Solomon for the material temple." We should like, indeed, to know in what sense the promise to Solomon is understood by such divines as our author. The presence of any Being may mean, first, the real residence of his power and essence in any peculiar locality; or secondly, the manifestation of his power through the means by which he acts upon other beings. And this manifestation may either be permanent or at intervals. It was permanent in the wilderness, where the pillar of the cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night were never withdrawn from the contemplation of Israel. It acted at intervals in the temple worship, when God was pleased at certain seasons to give visible proofs that He was ready to enter there into those relations which bound Him to His people. Nor is there any other sense than this last in which His constant presence in that place can be understood. To fancy that its scanty precincts confined the essence of that God, whose majesty filled heaven and earth, were a Gnostic impiety which would be universally rejected. That any permanent appearance was vouchsafed, rests on no evidence but the wildest dream of traditionary fable. It remains that God was pleased in that place to enter continually into union with His people. There was His throne. In that precinct did He hold His court. There was the mercy-seat, which encouraged men to address Him. This, as Mede suggests with great probability, is the peculiarity of that gift by angels which distinguished the Jewish Law. The train of the great King was attendant upon His court. And is there less of majesty in the

personal proximity of Christ our Lord? Is not the woman to have covering on her head because of the angels? Are these things, of which Jacob had a transient glimpse, to be undervalued by us, to whom they are more permanently promised? Our assemblies are not merely the gathering of men, but the gathering of the Church. The very external building has the same claim with the buildings of Solomon to that relative respect which belongs to the places in which the Most High vouchsafes to be at hand. It were unfitting to devote a king's palace, even during the absence of its inhabitant, to the viler uses of ordinary labour. Much less then may we forget that decency which should prevent irreverent intrusion into the courts of God.

Now, the doctrine of God's immediate presence with His worshippers follows naturally from the truth, that He has vouchsafed to deliver a portion of the children of men from their original ruin, and to associate them, through His Son, into His mystic family. With this family does He continually abide. His favours to its single members, His miraculous indwelling in their hearts, are bestowed through that common unity with the Christian body of which the place and time of public prayer, and the sacrifice of the Holy Communion, are the connecting links. "The whole body by joints and bands has nourishment ministered."

No doubt God is everywhere present: the very bounds of space are no limit to His power. But, inasmuch as man has become a stranger to Him by sin, and has separated himself from that near relation in which he was first created, therefore is he reunited by the new covenant, and the unity of grace triumphs over the alienation of nature. Now, whether God was pleased to manifest Himself in Paradise in specific place and manner we will not dispute. Mr. Close takes one side by himself, Mr. Arnold another with Hooker and Taylor. We will only say that a man must be singularly unimaginative who does not perceive that the tree of life was the sacrament of God's presence. Nor shall we question the assertion that in Heaven there may be no temple, for that there we shall see God as he is; but we cannot pass over what is so singularly censurable as Mr. Close's "Lazaretto" view of Christian churches. Let us quote a page from Mr. Arnold:—

*"Whether a Church is to be looked upon as a 'lazaretto for infected souls.'*

"Let us now consider the manner in which Mr. Close thinks our feelings with respect to churches ought to be modified by the affecting, humbling, conclusion, that 'ALL TEMPLES, ALTARS, CHURCHES, AND RELIGIOUS CEREMONIES, ARE THE BADGES AND PROOFS OF THE FALLEN, GUILTY STATE OF MAN.'

"He says, 'after we have done all' [in the way of decorating Christian Sanctuaries] 'well may we exclaim, Whence is all this? It is [from] sin! Sin has raised this vast pile; it is a house of



refuge for the guilty ! What is this temple but a lazaretto for infected souls ! What but an hospital for the reception "of the halt, and the maimed, and the blind ;"—it tells of benevolence and mercy, but it reminds us of our guilt and misery : and as when we contemplate some beautiful and extensive building—displaying the skill of the architect, and calculated to excite our highest admiration, and we ask—to what purpose is this building dedicated ? And it is replied, 'It is a LUNATIC ASYLUM !' how then does our heart sicken ! The edifice loses all its charms in our eyes—we turn away in sorrow, grieving more that man's calamity should need such an extensive receptacle of misery, than rejoicing at the benevolence, which has called it into existence : even so, a deeply pious and religious mind contemplating the noble religious edifices of his native land, will rather mourn over the madness of sin, and the insanity of vice, which created the necessity for these houses of mercy—than feel disposed to vaunt himself in their beauty or magnificence ! He never can forget that there was no temple in Paradise, and that there will be none in Heaven—because in Paradise and in Heaven there was no sin ! \*

"This is to me one of the most painfully offensive passages I remember to have ever read. It is *unreal, exaggerated, unsound*—nay, I will plainly assert that it is most *unscriptural*. It is obvious that all temples are as much 'badges and proofs' of sin as *any* can be : all, whatever may be the authority for erecting them, however awful the sanction by which their holiness is at once established and evidenced—all without exception are necessarily alike in this, that they are *equally* 'badges and proofs' of sin. If, therefore, it follows from this, that *any* temples are, as such, to be regarded as '*lazarettoes for infected souls,*' then *all* are to be looked upon in this light, and Solomon's among the rest : how then came the holy and inspired psalmist to feel all that rapturous love and zeal for the LORD's house, the place where HIS honour dwelt, which many of his sacred songs so beautifully express ? How came it that, when the old men wept over the diminished splendour of the second Temple, their merciful GOD, far from *reproving* their tears, *consoled* them by the gracious assurance, that in real, spiritual glory that house should exceed the first ?—nay, how came it that the blessed JESUS was eaten up by the zeal of GOD's house, and would not so much as let the people carry any vessel through the Temple, because the LORD's house was 'to be called of *all nations* the house of prayer ?' It was as a building set apart, not for the Mosaic rite of *sacrifice*, but for *prayer*, a duty of universal obligation, that CHRIST defended the honour of HIS FATHER's house : and are we to be told by a minister of CHRIST, that HIS zeal for the honour of GOD's house is no example for us : for that we are to contemplate a Church, not as a building dedicated immediately to GOD's glory, and contributing to man's salvation, but as one that is so inseparably connected in its origin with sin and guilt, that it ought immediately to suggest, not affectionate respect, for HIS sake to whose honour it is raised, and who blesses it to the good of souls, but the recollection of human sin and guilt, that make its erection necessary ?

---

\* Close, Church Architecture scripturally considered, p. 21.

"I say, then, that the notion of looking upon temples or churches, as 'houses of refuge for the guilty,' or 'lazarettoes for infected souls,' is *unscriptural*: because holy men *have been inspired by God's SPIRIT* to express love and affectionate reverence for temples, and to look upon them *objectively*, as raised to God's honour, as expressions of man's reverence, as the place where God is acceptably worshipt, rather than *subjectively*, as being rendered necessary by sin alone, and therefore ever suggesting the humbling consciousness of human guilt.

"Not only, however, is the passage unscriptural, but it contradicts man's *natural* feeling of *reverence* for holy places: and is not *unsound* only, but *exaggerated*, and, if I may say so, *unreal*. Even if a temple *ought* to be primarily considered as a *badge and proof of sin and guilt*, and not as a building dedicated to God's glory, yet even then it would not follow, that men may not lawfully, or cannot naturally, rejoice in the beauty of a sacred building. Mr. Close must at least confess, that, if the sight of temples and churches were necessarily accompanied with the distinct consciousness of sin and guilt, yet it would also bring to our minds the recollection, that there is now a possibility of *deliverance* from *sin* and its *consequent misery*: and is it not possible, natural, and lawful for us to regard with interest and reverence and joy, whatever *contributes* to that *deliverance*, or brings it strongly to our *recollection*?

"But what shall we say of the recklessness of such an assertion as this: that 'deeply pious and religious minds' 'CANNOT FORGET that there was no temple in Paradise, and that there will be none in Heaven!' I have shown that *two* 'deeply pious and religious minds,' Richard Hooker and Jeremy Taylor, have unhesitatingly taught that there was something *analogical* to a temple even in Paradise, and yet, according to Mr. Close's assertion, they must have been all the time *unable to forget* that there was *none*! I have shown that there are passages in Holy Writ which *speak of a temple in heaven*; and yet, for Mr. Close's assertion to be true, it must be also true that no deeply pious and religious mind can, *even when reading the descriptions of temple-worship in heaven*, forget that there will be no temple there! Such assertions are really moral, as well as intellectual, obliquities."—*Arnold's Remarks*, pp. 7—10.

We cannot doubt that every one will acquiesce in these just and temperate rebukes. Indeed, what can Mr. Close say to all those memorials of man's recovery, which, not the Church only, but the inspired writers have thought worthy of honour? What was the ark but the memorial of God's favour to the few who escaped from a perishing world? Should men view it then with other feelings than those of reverence and thankfulness? Is the Scripture to be treated on the lazaretto principle? Should we serve it as the Egyptians did the embowellers of the dead, who had no sooner done their hateful office than they were contumeliously ejected from the houses where their services were required? Shall we censure the time-honoured usage which has ever arrayed the cross with the ornaments of sculp-

ture, because what was once the shame has been converted by the passion into the trophy of mankind? "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." All these things proceed upon a principle, too often lost sight of, that the blessings of grace are more than a counterpart for the miseries of the Fall. "Not as the offence so also is the free gift." "For if by one man's offence death reigned by one: much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one Jesus Christ." That new Jerusalem, therefore, the Church of God, has no reason to fall back on the original condition of mankind, as though it were a more glorious portion than that which awaits it. For man was *made* a little lower than the angels, but those who attain to that world shall be *as* the angels of God. Already, by hope and privilege, by expectation and promise, by grace and spiritual union, are these mighty blessings bestowed upon mankind. Away, then, with the lazaretto view of our churches, which would degrade that Holy Spirit which is thus bestowed. The delusion is too grave to trifle with, or we might point out the manifold absurdities which it involves. Is it reasonable that those who have profited by a physician's skill should hate the person through whom their sickness was abated? Is it not usual for the popular preacher to expect favour and gratitude from those whom he awakens to increased devotion? Do we not hear sometimes that in his case this principle is even carried further than is meet? Let the "lazaretto" view prevail, and there will be no more purses in return for his honied words, no embroidered slippers will reward his bland gesticulations. What will our author say to such a consequence of his reasoning?

But it is time we turned to the other subject to which Mr. Close calls attention, and by virtue of which he would fain draw off our thoughts from the real tendency of his labours. Their manifest effect is to render men satisfied with the condition of our churches during the last century of irreverence. He dwells in succession on the assertions, 1st, That in Paradise there was no temple; 2dly, That there will be none in heaven; 3dly, That churches, as we now have them, are in their origin and nature associated with Popery—all reasons for detracting from that respect to which it is commonly held that they are entitled. This done, Mr. Close proceeds to a further assertion, which, though not the chief point in his book, he tells us, in his Reply, was the main cause of his writing—his fear, namely, of "the restoration of Popish Emblems;" and he quotes, but not very fairly, some passages from the Ecclesiologist. He cites, for instance, a letter addressed to that periodical, in which an anonymous correspondent gives an account of an altar-cloth, as a "specimen of ancient embroidering by hand." The subject of the altar-cloth [the Virgin worshipped by angels] is mentioned,

without commendation. Does Mr. Close hold the Society of Antiquaries to be responsible for the worship of Jupiter, because they relate the discovery of a coin with the inscription, "Jovi Opt. Max?"

Yet it is scarcely needful to defend the Society on this ground; for if we look at the dangerous expression which Mr. Close selects to bracket in italics in the text of his Reply, (*Close's Reply*, p. 35,) his objection seems to be founded on the use, in this letter, of the words "*our Lady*," which he probably forgets to be sanctioned by that Book of Common Prayer to which he has declared his unfeigned acquiescence.

But we must dwell a little more on this matter of Emblems.

We are ready, of course, to allow that undesirable and wrong emblems may be introduced into our churches; but we object to this attempt to raise a prejudice against all emblems by calling them popish. The Book of Common Prayer, the use of the surplice, the ring in marriage, the cross in baptism, have often been assailed on this ground, and may again be open to attacks. If a popish emblem is an emblem used by the Romanists, what can be more so than the surplice? And do not Romanists mark their children with the cross? Now this mode of creating a prejudice is unfair, unless it is intended to carry it out systematically. If Mr. Close abandons his surplice, and renounces the Prayer Book, he may object to whatsoever is shared by the adherents of Rome; till that time he should be able to prove that the emblems which he censures are not only sanctioned by the use of the Romanists, but are either dangerous or sinful.

Meanwhile, we have no wish to contend with him respecting individual emblems. We think that in things which are not of faith, nothing can be safer than to keep to usage and obedience. But, strange to say, it is by a notice in which the Camden Society records the sanction of our Church to particular usages, that Mr. Close's wrath is particularly excited. The writer in the *Ecclesiologist* cites the authority of the Church of England for certain things and practices—he may be wrong, but, at all events, his conduct is not undutiful—but this is nothing to Mr. Close so long as the same usages are approved by Rome. (*Close*, p. 82.) And so much he thinks he may be sure of, that the Homilies, viewed as a whole, are with him. He makes little account, apparently, of that thorough opposition to their doctrinal views which we noticed above; but he says that they declared the excessive use of ornaments to be a prevalent and a dangerous error. But he forgets to ask, whether that which prevailed in 1544, is still prevalent in 1844. The general principles which the Homilies express; the assertion that God is not less present with the assembly of his united servants than he was when they entered between Jachin and Boaz into the temple of Solomon;—this is the same now as ever. If the Homilies asserted it rightly 300 years ago, then is Mr. Close

wrong in denying it at present. But to assume that men differ from the Homilies because they think that the fault of the nineteenth may be different from the fault of the sixteenth century—this is as absurd as to assume that, because there is an excess of rain at Christmas, therefore in May we must pray for dry weather.

And here, therefore, we join issue with Mr. Close, without wishing to derogate from the Homilies. Abuses there doubtless were in that day which required correction. The predominance of external religion was excessive. The contrary is the present case. Our great danger is not superstition, but infidelity. Our manufacturing population are fast sinking into the most perfect neglect of all the outward accessories to devotion. What is human and earthly has gained the predominance. To set before them some objective truths, which should draw them off from the mere repetition of one another's ways and maxims,—to fix their thoughts on the great mysteries of religion, which lie without themselves,—to give them permanent subjects for meditation, which may attach their minds to the life and death, the sufferings and triumph of Christ our Lord,—all this, in the present day, we assert to be most salutary. We repeat, that we do not wish to do it in contravention of our Church's rules; that we desire to study her will in making this use of the treasures of art and nature, but we must indignantly reject the puritanic motion to throw away these precious means of benefiting our brethren, because it is asserted that at times they have been superstitiously employed.

Let us go on, then, to point out what is, in this respect, the real tendency of Mr. Close's work. We have said that the effect of its main portion (not that we attribute to him so bad an intention) is to induce our people to employ their money upon themselves rather than upon God's service;—to leave our parish churches in the state of filth, meanness and neglect, which are their too common characteristics. Now, as this is the tendency of one part of his book, so would the other lead us to abandon a large part of those holy and useful ordinances which were preserved for us by the wisdom of our Reformers.

The friends of the Reformation were of two parties; and in this land the more moderate and prudent were happily the most powerful. But it was not till the end of Elizabeth's reign that the bitterness of that Puritan leaven, which afterwards overflowed into the Great Rebellion, displayed itself in formal separation from the Church of Christ. Till then, many Puritan leaders were courted through hope of disarming their opposition, or tolerated because they concealed it. Pilkington and Whittingham were Bishop and Dean of Durham, though the one avowed his dislike to the Church's rules, and the other was not in orders. The aversion of such men to that wholesome order which they could not escape, is manifested by the recent pub-

lication of many of their works by the Parker Society. Now, if Mr. Close appeals to the Camden Society, as showing that dangerous projects are afloat, inasmuch as it is wished to revive such external religion as can find sanction from the laws of our Church, much more may we quote the publications of this contemporaneous body, as proving a set purpose to *puritanize* the National Church. For what are Mr. Close's standard authorities? Men "who disliked the cap and surplice," and who encouraged that deadly enemy to the Church, the Earl of Leicester, by putting into his mouth the suggestion "how all reformed countries had cast away Popish apparel with the Pope, and that we continued to keep it as a holy relic." \*

Now believing, as we do, that we approach the time of a new struggle for the best portions of our inheritance, we think it but just that Mr. Close and his friends should tell us plainly how far they wish to go with the Puritans of antiquity. We find in Strype a table "of the bringing in of devices of the Popish corruptions yet remaining in our English Church." Under this table are brought the "conjured font; godfathers and godmothers; women to baptize children; confirmation or bishoping of children; standing at the Gospel; the dividing of the chancel, bells, organs, surplices, prick-song, and many more, assigning under what Popes they were brought in, and in what year."† We desire to know how far Mr. Close will go with these innovators? for how much have we to contend? We see that the consecration of churches, and the division of the edifice, are two of the very points which he attacks. But what will he say to confirmation? How will the presbyter of Cheltenham settle this question with his brother of Gloucester? Again, does he propose to throw off the surplice? This was that very relic of popery against which his authority, Pilkington, the most objected. And with good reason. For what means the assumption of a peculiar dress, especially of that ancient garb of the priesthood, but that the officiator is then called to a public part, presents the people's petitions as their recognised minister, and intercedes below, as does the Great and True Priest before the throne of the Father? Idle and futile had been the attack and defence of this remnant of antiquity, if it had not possessed a real meaning and a sacred importance. And how idle is it, then, to quote Pilkington against the fearful evil of triptychs, when the far more hated abomination of the surplice remains unabated!

And here we take leave of Mr. Close. He tells us, at the commencement of his work, that he has no time for study; and, from appearances, we fear that he can have laid in little store of theological reading in those momentous years which the future occupants of pulpits are too apt to devote to idleness and frivolity. Hence the frippery and bombast of his style,

\* Strype's Parker, ii. 19, p. 309.

† Strype's Annals, ii. 14, p. 218.



savouring neither of deep thought nor a chastened imagination. Hence the singularly crude and unguarded nature of his statements; their manifest contrariety to the acknowledged authorities of the English Church, to Hooker and Taylor, to the Homilies, above all, to the Scriptures. If he had no time for such researches, it is to be regretted that he did not submit his thoughts to some more learned brother of his own school, before he submitted them to the public. Mr. Goode, or any other critic of the same class, would have suggested to him to choose between prose and poetry; would have asked him how he knew that the mighty pyramids of Egypt were identified with idolatry; (*Close*, p. 9;) what could possibly induce him to think that an evil spirit had taken possession of the temple while the Apostles were still worshipping in its courts; (*Close*, p. 57;) how he came to know that God was unwilling "to allow a permanent temple to be erected" to him; (*Close*, p. 33;) lastly, by what possible hallucination he could confound a church with a lunatic asylum. (*Close*, p. 21.) We remember nothing like this last mistake, except the story in one of our British essayists of what passed, during a fit of sickness, through the sensorium of a celebrated infidel, to whom a church, with two attendant clergymen, seemed to be the castle of some formidable giants.

All these strange fancies of the Incumbent of Cheltenham had far better have been pointed out to him by his friends: the dignity of his office, and the importance of his position, render it in the last degree undesirable that he should display himself so unguardedly to the censorious world; and yet, little as we value his work, we have one reason for thanking him—he has called into the walks of theology an author whose habits of study, sobriety of expression, and justness of thought, qualify him to deal with such subjects. We are glad to hail Mr. Arnold as a fellow-labourer in the great work of restoring habits of reverence among the English people. He writes like a good man—the first requisite for such pursuits—and, moreover, like one who is well imbued with the spirit of our English worthies. His services to the cause of classical education we have long valued. We hope for greater things in this higher walk of service. From such writers we may expect, under God's blessing, an abundant benefit.

"Demetri, teque Tigelli,  
Discipularum intra jubeo plorare cathedras."

With our proof, comes another pamphlet of Mr. Arnold, in answer to Mr. Close's reply. We have only time to see that it is learned and able, and that he tracks Mr. Close to the Dissenting authorities, who have taught him his facts and suggested his arguments. We suppose that Mr. Close must perceive by this time that it is unsafe to publish without thought and reading.

1. *The English Churchman, Times, &c.*
2. *The Record, Church and State Gazette, Morning Herald, Standard, Oxford Chronicle, &c. &c. &c., for September.*

"I next wrote two papers of the 'Remembrancer,' and two more of the same in the year 1749. About the same time I wrote a pamphlet, called *Delenda est Oxonia*. It was to assert the liberties of that University, which the Ministry had a plan of attacking. This piece (which I think one of my best) was seized at the printer's and suppressed."—*Short Notes of the Life of Horace Walpole, written by Himself. Walpole's Letters to Mann*, vol. iv. p. 342. (Edition 1844.)

THE above passage, which accidentally fell in our way, seems to go far towards establishing the Stoical doctrine of an iron fate, in which the events of the world seem cyclically to repeat themselves like a recurring decimal; the doctrine has been lately revived, we hear, by Mr. John Mill. The cometic period of Oxford, then, closely approximates to a century. There was then a REMEMBRANCER—we trust that ours will be chronicled with equal exactness a hundred years hence; a gentleman wrote two papers in it, the subjects of which, like any of our own twin articles, he has not thought proper to divulge: the same writer,—though we are not altogether desirous to enact Pythagoras to the Panthoides Euphorbus of the lord of Strawberry Hill—moved by a just regard to the liberty of the subject, though what *he* had to do with Oxford we have not the remotest conception, rushed into print and pamphleteering under the taking title of *Delenda est Oxonia*: the Ministry of the day had a plan of attacking the liberties of that University, and *they failed!* Thus far the parallel is complete and literally exact. We accept the omen; whether or not we think the present piece one of our best, we hope to be rather more modest than our prototype in declaring; but we care not to write under auspices more engaging and hopeful. There are two particulars in which 1844 differs from 1749: the Ministry of *that* day "had a plan of attacking the liberties of the University, by vesting in the Crown the nomination of the Chancellor" (the forthcoming visitors will perhaps thank us for the hint); the Ministry of *this* day, we believe, are rather anxious that "our liberties should be attacked" by resident Governors merely; and so long as such resident Governors are only nominees of the Chancellor, and the Chancellor is the Ministry, the difference is neither extreme nor material. Anyhow there is a feature, and that an important one, common to the two periods,—the existence of a "plan for attacking the liberties of the University." And whatever was the fate of that truculent brochure, *Delenda est Oxonia*, we can at present augur vitality for *our* speculations, only because we happen to print in London. It may be said

that the day of seizing and suppressing pamphlets is over; how soon it may recur, who can tell? before 1849—before the *annus magnus* of Oxford's fate reappears—things promise fairly for a good substantial censorship in Oxford. Even now we expect a domiciliary visit to our publisher's shop: "my bedel" may be up by the very next train. There is a dangerous proximity between Portman-street and Paddington—and what a sensation in Bread-street-hill, if Mr. Vice-Chancellor Wynter, at the head of the Clarendon delegates, and preceded by the whole staff of silver pokers, were once more to reproduce poor Walpole's fate—rush into our printer's court-yard, and "seize and suppress" our *Delenda est Oxonia*, at the same time handing over the REMEMBRANCER and its writers to the tender mercies of Bocardo—six Doctors—a Board of Heresy—Martial and Inquisitorial Law—and the Delegates of Appeals! We are not quite sure that we are safe yet. This railroad, though it wofully affects the character of Convocation, may destroy a little of our once-distant security.

*Delenda est Oxonia!* yes, the phrase is apt and congruent; there is a complete plan, a principle at work for overturning the received University constitution: it is like the well-known political epoch of the last century; the influence of the Hebdomadal Board has increased, is increasing, and must be checked: and it is for this reason, especially, that we are satisfied that it is the duty of those who wish well to the Church of this country to oppose, according to their opportunities, the proposed election of Dr. Symons to the Vice-Chancellorship of Oxford. For let it be borne in mind that as the Universities, Oxford especially, are the epitome of the Church, so the battle of the Church had much better be fought out in the Convocation-House at Oxford than elsewhere: it is the same contest, the same principles are at stake, and this everybody seems to feel. A victory won, or an imminent danger averted at Oxford,—and the Church principle receives so much additional strength. A piece of oppression and injustice passed over without a protest or a struggle at Oxford,—and the same unfairness and party-spirit will be set at work with tenfold vindictiveness and success against the whole body of the clergy, which has proved successful against the Masters of Arts. The members of Convocation are the advanced-guard: they have to keep the look-out for the whole army: on them rests the solemn responsibility of never permitting the slightest compromise of principle, which they can prevent: they are a small body; but on the success or defeat of principle with them rests the peace, it may be the existence, of the Church. Indeed, it is a very wonderful phenomenon this secret power of the Oxford Convocation: but it may be thought that we are overstating the actual value of its influence. Look at the value of its decisions. At the last Church Reform clamour, what settled

the question but the Oxford decision against modifying subscription? What was the first great check, and significant warning which the Reform ministry received, but Dr. Hampden's condemnation? When the whole country, Evangelicals and Latitudinarians combined with Dissenters, Radicals, Chartists, and Whigs, agreed to "put down Tractarianism," what saved—humanly speaking—the Church, but Dr. Hampden's second condemnation? And what was the value of the recent decision against the Theological Statute, but to announce afresh the *stare super vias antiquas*? So of every victory achieved: the Macmullen case; the indignant protest of the 230 non-resident members against Dr. Wynter's conduct; the rejection of the silly Taylor and Randolph scheme; these are not so much in themselves important as that they serve to show that responsibility is vested in trustworthy hands.

The Convocation of Oxford is responsible to others than to its own members: it is a body much, and very deservedly, looked up to: its influences, for good or for evil, are enormous. It represents officially one-half of the priesthood—one fair moiety of the "clerisy" of the country, the *clerk-hood* that is—the nobility and gentry also. It has duties towards the Church—towards those very numerous persons who, once having taken a degree, for various reasons have severed their connexion with the Academical Body—towards the junior members of the University in the way of example—towards Cambridge, and its members, in the way of counsel—towards the great body of the Christian laity, who in different ways are influenced by a decision, for such it is, on the part of Convocation. For which reasons, and now more than ever, most important is it that every step in Oxford, pregnant as such must be with illimitable consequences, ought to be most seriously weighed before it is resolved upon. Such we believe to be the case with the opposition now resolved upon to the appointment of Dr. Symons, Warden of Wadham, to the Vice-Chancellorship of Oxford.

The question of the right of Convocation is explained in a clearly-written article in the *English Churchman* of Sept. 12, which states the course of academical practice and law, we believe, correctly:—

"The Vice-Chancellor holds an annual office; to this he is nominated by the Chancellor from the Heads of Colleges. It has become the prescriptive practice for the same individual to hold this office for four successive years, by annual nominations; and the custom, of some years' standing, is, we believe, this: that the new Vice-Chancellor is always the senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor who has not already served the office, or has not been exempted from serving. The Pro-Vice-Chancellors are four in number,—the two junior being those who are next in rotation for serving, and are willing to serve, and are considered

by the Vice-Chancellor, who appoints them, fit for the office ; and the two senior, either ex-Vice-Chancellors, or such as have been allowed to pass by the office, but are supposed to know something of the business connected with it, if occasionally called to act for the Vice-Chancellor. It must be borne in mind that all these regulations are conventional ; there is no statute prescribing them. We are right in stating that the Chancellor may nominate any Head of a College for his Commissary-General, which is the legal title of the Vice-Chancellor ; that if again nominated, and again approved, such Vice-Chancellor may hold office for any indefinite time,\* or, after an interval, may be re-elected ; and that the Vice-Chancellor may nominate as his Pro-Vice-Chancellors (*deputati*) any four Heads of Colleges whom he pleases. The Chancellor is not compelled to nominate for his Commissary a Pro-Vice-Chancellor ; the Vice-Chancellor is bound to no rule in his selection of deputies ; neither seniority nor cycle regulates the appointment of any one of these officials ; it is entirely a matter of prescriptive custom. But it so happens that the individual who would, according to the present custom of the Chancellor and Convocation, on the next avoidance of the Vice-Chancellorship, be nominated and approved, is Dr. Symons, Warden of Wadham ; and for these reasons, that Dr. Wynter's four years of office expire on the 10th of October next, and that Dr. Symons happens to be the senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor who has not refused the office."

Clear, however, as the power vested in Convocation is, the exercise of it now is called a personal slight on the Duke of Wellington. A very able letter in the *Times* of Sept. 25, under the signature of a "Member of Convocation," addressed to the Chancellor, sets this question in the clearest light.

"Dr. Symons, the Warden of Wadham College, stands next in rotation for your Grace's nomination to the Vice-Chancellorship ; and will, according to University routine, be nominated by you to that office the beginning of next term. This, as your Grace knows, is a mere matter of rotation : Dr. Symons is not nominated by you in the sense of being your own choice. A Vice-Chancellor by rotation is not, by the very force of the term, the *choice* of anybody. Your Grace nominates indeed, and in the sense of being the *channel* of his appointment, you appoint him ; but it would be simply untrue to say that you *chose* him. I am speaking of things as they are—of the customary University routine, with which your Grace has never yet interfered. Your Grace, like your predecessors in the Chancellorship, allows routine to dictate to you : it is a regular understood thing that it is so ; nobody thinks of a Vice-Chancellorship as being your Grace's *bonâ fide* appointment ; nobody identifies you ever so distantly with the Vice-Chancellor that you happen to *have* to nominate. Nobody thinks of a Vice-Chancellor's appointment except as the simple result of University machinery and clockwork ; and the nomination of

\* "We find Tresham Vice-Chancellor from 1532 to 1546 ; again in 1550 ; again in 1556 ; and, finally, in 1558-59. Humphreys held office for six years ; Accepted Frewin for 1628-29, and again in 1638 ; and, in more settled times, Halton was Vice-Chancellor from 1679-1681 ; and again in 1685."

Dr. Symons, if nominated next time, will be simply this, and nothing more.

"What I am going to mention, then, cannot, by any possibility, appear the least interference with your Grace, or reflection upon you; and it would be insulting your Grace's good sense to suppose that you could take it so. It is intended, on the part of some members of Convocation, to oppose the appointment of the person whom the order of rotation marks for the office next time—I mean Dr. Symons. Your Grace may be aware that members of Convocation have this right. Every year, as often as a nomination of a Vice-Chancellor takes place, they are formally asked whether they assent to it—*Placetne vobis magistri*? The exertion of the right is indeed unusual; but that fact does not in the least nullify the right itself. There are many instances to be found in our civil and ecclesiastical system in which rights go on, having a full and complete legal force, though suffered by common consent to sleep for vast intervals of time, and be without ostensible existence. The Corporation of London have, on two occasions of elections to the Mayoralty within the last ten years, departed from the regular established order of rotation to that office, and violated a routine that appeared beforehand to have almost the force of law; and examples, more or less important, and illustrating the case in a higher or lower degree, occur constantly. The principle of quiescent rights is, indeed, invaluable as a constitutional principle; allowing institutions all the advantages of system and order, and providing at the same time against the tendencies to stagnation. With legal rights always exercised, institutions would become unmanageable; wholly without such mementos, they would become feeble. Perpetual routine tends to abuses—perpetual recurrence to statute to disorder. A class of rights there should be, ready when wanted to be appealed to, and quiet till they are appealed to. The quiescent right is the medium between the two extremes, permitting things to go on upon routine until principle steps in; maintaining a state of things, and not failing an emergency.

"That the right, then, which some members of Convocation are going to exert has been a quiescent one, is no argument against it. Those members of the University who oppose Dr. Symons's appointment will be exercising a strictly statutable and constitutional power—a power which their academical degree has put into their hands for the express purpose of being exercised when a fitting emergency occurs.

"Legal and statutable, however, as such an exercise of right is, an order of rotation still carries such great practical advantages with it, that to interrupt it would be evidently unjustifiable, without some special, strong, and definite reason to assign for the interruption. Is there any such reason to assign in the present case?"

And to our own minds, the chief reason for opposing Dr. Symons arises from the present state of the University, attributable mainly to the gradual, yet most certain, encroachments of the Hebdomadal Board upon the rights of the Lower House. It is now a case of *παθήματα μάθηματα*: we know what we have to expect from what we have already suffered. Under favourable auspices we have had despotism, tyranny, and every sort of



injustice, a tolerable augury for a rule which it is known does not even aim at impartiality. The present Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Wynter, was not a pledged man, had never committed himself, set up according to some accounts for a High-Churchman, according to all reports sought to pass for one of the old orthodox, Church and State, Establishment men, and yet what his rule has been everybody knows. What, then, are we to anticipate from one who is notoriously the reverse of all this? Active, enterprising, and polemical—pledged and committed against the most eminent men in the University; one who has already with curious dexterity succeeded in reducing his own college to a congenial uniformity, which presents a strange and ominous contrast to all other societies: on every account, in appointing a new Vice-Chancellor, were we bound to be cautious into whose hands we transferred an office which lately had been magnified beyond the dignities which ten centuries have conferred upon it—most cautious should we be if there were the most distant chance of giving power to a Low-Church man of the most extreme type. If Dr. Wynter, a sort of High-Churchman, thinks proper to suspend Dr. Pusey without a trial, and to aggrandize to himself and successors the power of refusing degrees to persons whose theology they dislike, not *a fortiori*, but *a fortissimo*, what could be anticipated from Dr. Symons? We have again recourse to the *Times* correspondent, for his clever account of the Wynter dynasty,—his amplification of the *χειρέρια τὰ πράγματα*.

“Without going into the details of either of these cases, the main facts, even as the other side admits them, are enough for my purpose. Dr. Pusey, according to the present Vice-Chancellor’s own admission, was condemned without a hearing. A decision was come to against him without a particle of theological evidence having been heard on the side of the accused—without a word of defence having been received—without a single opportunity having been given him of justifying what he said. And that decision was, moreover—and this point should be specially attended to—not a condemnation only of the sermon, but a punishment of the man. A secret tribunal that did not assign, and never have to this day assigned, any reasons for their theological decision, proceeded to support that decision by a *punishment*; and suspended the accused. This is, at any rate, a contradiction to the commonest notions of justice. Even if a decision upon a document without hearing the evidence in explanation could be excused, a punishment of an individual never could. The fact of an actual punishment being involved in the matter, at once brings Dr. Pusey’s case under that known and recognised protective principle of law, which fastens punishment to trial, and allows no judge to inflict personal loss on a man, without hearing what he has to say in his defence.

“Mr. Macmullen’s exclusion from his degree of B.D. was, in the same way, a personal loss and deprivation inflicted upon a member of the University, without a shadow of legitimate ground for inflicting

it. The University system absolutely knows nothing of—does not (as a legal objection to a degree) recognise the existence of—the ground upon which Mr. Macmullen's degree was refused. It was refused because the Regius Professor of Divinity did not individually approve of some theological statement in Mr. Macmullen's dissertations. The University attaches no authority whatever to the individual religious opinions of a Regius Professor; and the refusal of a degree, therefore, upon the ground of some of those opinions not being agreed with by the candidate for the degree, was to base an exceedingly strong and highly invidious public act of power upon a single individual's unrecognised opinion and wish. The case is made much stronger by another important fact; for not only is the theology of the present Regius Professor, Dr. Hampden, *not* an authoritative one—not obligatory in the eyes of the University upon her members—but that very theology has been itself condemned by the University, and did then, and does at this moment, lie under a public and formal University censure. So far from being a legitimate judge of the orthodoxy of others, Dr. Hampden is not, in the eye of the University, an orthodox theologian himself.

"I repeat, then, that those two acts of the present Vice-Chancellorship, which I have mentioned, were palpable and direct invasions and infringements on the plain, common, constitutional rights of members of the University. And I will add a third act, which, though it did not affect any one member of the University personally, was a most broad—I must literally say gross—violation of the rights of Convocation as a body. I allude to the Vice-Chancellor's refusal in open Convocation last year to recognise the *non placets* which were given to the proposal of Mr. Everett's degree—which *non placets* he had been distinctly told would be given, as he himself stated immediately before going into Convocation. That is to say, whereas the constitution of the University requires the assent of a majority of Convocation to be obtained previous to conferring a degree; he knowingly conferred a degree without ascertaining that assent, and thus directly violated that University constitution."

To connect the fact of Dr. Wynter's reign with the hypothesis of Dr. Symons's reign is easy. We have already pointed it out upon a clear moral anticipation: it is well known that Dr. Symons is an ardent admirer of Dr. Wynter's policy: his will be, must be, a Rehoboam's policy; and the fact of the present Vice-Chancellorship being what it is, makes us more than ever suspicious for the future. The natural tendency of such precedents as have been recently set, is, unless they are checked, to establish themselves.

"The fact is," says the writer in the *Times*, "that an unconstitutional Vice-Chancellorship is very sure to continue, and reproduce itself, unless a definite check is given. Unconstitutional precedents in the academical sphere, just as in the political, have a great power of self-perpetuation. They gain a regular position, unless protested against; they establish themselves in time; they get looked upon as the natural and congenial standards of public

right; they set the tone which is to speak of them, and dictate their own commentary and critical point of view; instead of the system condemning them, they in time interpret the system; they create their own legal atmosphere, and gradually ratify their own usurpations. To those who have really observed the course of things in the University for some time past, the remark is no new one, that there has been a decided and growing disposition of late years on the part of the Hebdomadal Board to aggrandize themselves at the expense of Convocation, and to put altogether out of their field of deliberation and regard the great body of the University. The latter is never consulted upon any one legislative measure in prospect; and the result is, that an Hebdomadal Board, that lives shut up from the public society of the place, and never chooses to take a private adviser out of it, is literally ignorant of what measures the University requires, and has left to Convocation of late the simple office of sending it back, time after time, as they came out, its legislative crudities and blunders. The great body of the University—and I say it without fear of contradiction—its reading, thinking, working members—men of intellect and information—not young men fresh from their degrees, but men of fair age and standing, and of minds formed and matured—the body which conducts the education of the place, and which makes the University what it is—are treated exactly as if they had no voice in the matter; as if they were an accident of the University, and the Hebdomadal Board the exclusive reality.”

In a word, let us realize the present state of the University, and witness how Convocation is treated; how the Heads of Houses are striving to monopolize every fragment of power—creating new patronage, and confining it to their own body—reviving old statutes when it seems to suit their purpose, and making new ones only to strengthen their usurpations; let us pay accurate attention to all the unfairness of Oxford’s governors, and we shall gladly seize the present opportunity of establishing, against the present assumptions of the Heads of Houses, 1. That the Vice-Chancellor’s nomination may be opposed in Convocation; and 2. That the present state of the University peculiarly requires a strong and decided expression on the part of the M.A.s to vindicate their own privileges.

But in the matter of Dr. Pusey’s sermon, was Dr. Symons, as one of the Six Doctors, the most guilty party? Are we not visiting upon him the sin of his predecessor, Dr. Wynter, compared with whom—we speak of him only in his academical capacity, and throughout this paper desire to sever academical from personal responsibility,—we speak of individuals but only as invested with caps and gowns, an attire which seems almost to transform personal, certainly moral, identity—compared with whom, the judge who has become a proverb,

“Castigatque auditque dolos,”

is a model of judicial equity? Well: even if we were to own that it is so: admit that Dr. Wynter *is* the greater criminal, what

then? Because we have allowed one to slip through the meshes of justice, are we to permit the same license to two? Is there to be no room for a more healthy and honest course? Are we to be tied to the consequences of *one* mistake, if it was one? Is there such a stern necessity in blundering, that we are never to recover it? Suppose that—which looks like the case—the thing itself, viz. the justice of rejecting Dr. Wynter, was never fairly brought out last October; suppose that all sorts of well-meaning but mischievous reasons were, and successfully, urged against an opposition to Dr. Wynter then; such as the fact that it were invidious to reject him after three years of his rule were expired; the need of peace; the ignorance which all felt about the details of such rejection; the absence of preparation, &c. All this may be very true; and if we grant that it was very weak not to have rejected Dr. Wynter; still we cannot connect this blunder with present duties. Dr. Wynter ought to have been turned out; therefore Dr. Symons must be allowed to escape. Why, assuming for the present the criminality of each, because prisoner A, who pulled the trigger, gets off by a flaw in the indictment, therefore prisoner B, who handed him the gun, is not guilty. We may be very stupid, but the consequence is not quite self-evident. If we do not oppose Dr. Symons now, we shall never be justified in opposing *any* nomination of any Vice-Chancellor: now we make a false step with our eyes open: if Dr. Symons is passed over, the independence of the University is at an end, as far as its voice in the election of Vice-Chancellors is to go. No greater academical criminals than the President of St. John's and the Warden of Wadham can by any possibility exist: they have exhausted the class. To pass over one was bad enough: to pass over two, stamps a precedent into a principle. Two wrongs cannot make one right. Dr. Hampden himself, were his nomination possible, must pass without a murmur, if Dr. Symons is to be spared. We may regret our mistaken lenity or levity, in Dr. Wynter's case; but, by not opposing Dr. Symons, we go further, we justify it. The one was a blunder, this is a deliberate choice. The one was a weakness, this an act of the will. Much allowance may be made for the necessities of the former case; haste, ignorance, false charity, timidity, what not. None such excuse will stand now. The matter has been fairly mooted—openly canvassed—deliberately resolved upon. We are asked to take our side: on the one hand, justice, openness, and fairness; on the other, a secret tribunal, a monstrous perversion of law, a threatened and most intelligible oppression for four years. We shrunk, for various reasons, from acting against the principal; but, now that the opportunity is given, why should this force us to take part with the accomplice? Besides, the truth is, that Dr. Wynter's *most* serious offences have taken place *since*

last October. Dr. Symons's reign is a fresh start, and therefore the very best opportunity for a new and decided appeal against such a tyranny as the last, under which we have suffered so much.

Then, again, it is said: But who knows which way Dr. Symons voted among the Six Doctors? What means have we of judging whether his opinion concurred with those of the majority? Who has told what the Six Doctors—one or all—ever said? Perhaps it was the mere tyrannical act of Dr. Wynter. Anyhow, Dr. Pusey was held to silence—gagged, as well as broken on the wheel. Why are we to act against Dr. Symons as though his share of the Board of Heresy were well known?

To which the replies are various:—

1. Moral certainty is one thing,—mathematical demonstration another. If we are never to act in ethical questions except on the latter, we must be either knaves or fools. If there is in wide England one human being who in his heart of hearts believes that Dr. Symons did *not* concur in the sentence on Dr. Pusey, then he is justified in fighting his battles; not only ought he not to vote *against* Dr. Symons, but he ought to vote *for* him,—(so would we if this were made clear);—he is bound, moreover, to show *why* he thinks thus of Dr. Symons, and to write articles and pamphlets in Dr. Symons's favour. But till anybody does this, we shall assume that Dr. Symons did concur in the persecution of Dr. Pusey,—did, if not instigate it, help it: and this upon the common rules of evidence. It is all very well to pretend to be ignorant which way Dr. Symons went among the members of the Board of Heresy; but, if this principle is good for anything, pray let it be carried out fairly,—let Dr. Hampden have the benefit of it. Who ever saw him write his Bampton lecture? was no one justified in voting against him but such as heard his sermons? O'Connell—what right have we to form, or to express, an opinion about him? We were never on the Hill of Clontarf. We desire, as far as we can, to speak respectfully of those who fancy, or try to fancy, themselves relieved from the duty of forming a judgment about Dr. Symons, because the decision of the Six has never been published; but we beg them to remember that all the world will think this only a sham, and make-believe of superfine hair-splitting: it will be set down for cowardice, not conscientiousness; for shirking plain duty, and not for sensitive justice. Do we believe—morally are we certain—that Dr. Symons did, or did not, concur in, and as far as in him lay, help Dr. Pusey's suspension? Because it is on this that conscience is required to act; this assurance is to honest men the index of duty. Dr. Symons would be the very last to conceal, or to regret his share in the condemnation of Dr. Pusey.

2. Besides, all this secrecy,—which, on the last hypothesis, of

course, is to be urged in favour of Dr. Symons, or, rather, in mitigation of his punishment,—is the very principle of the unjust system upon which the Hebdomadal Board are now acting, and striving to tyrannize over the University. In so far, then, as in any way Dr. Symons has permitted himself to be mixed up with this practice of secrecy, just so far is he unfit for the office which he claims. It is precisely this secret system which must be broken up. The Vice-Chancellor suspends Dr. Pusey for two years, 1. Without condescending to say whether in *his* opinion a certain sermon was heretical; or, 2. Whether the Six Doctors, his assessors, agreed with him; or, 3. Advised him; or, 4. How they voted; or, 5. Whether the sentence was his, or theirs, or anybody's. And to all this mass of iniquity Dr. Symons is a consenting party: like another gentleman in London, either Dr. Symons is what all the world gives him the credit of being, *or*, like the alderman, he is possessed of self-denial under obloquy unparalleled since the austere days of Roman heroism. If innocent,—that is, if Dr. Symons did not help in condemning Dr. Pusey,—then ought Dr. Symons to say so: is he sworn to secrecy, like poor Dr. Pusey? Is the whole thing a matter of black veils, and wax candles, and sable hangings, and masked inquisitors, and shadowy questioners, and sliding springs, and secret cells, like Mrs. Radcliffe's romances? Because, if so, the sooner that *Protestant* England yells down this wickedness the better: or, if Dr. Symons did disagree with the majority of the Six, and honourably shrinks from exculpating himself at the expense of his colleagues, then are *they* bound to come forward and to exculpate him. Somehow, and in some quarter, and by some hands, the veil ought to be torn down; or if not, let Dr. Symons take the consequences. A foul deed of wickedness was done, and done in the dark; and seven men were present at it: past a question all this; and every tribunal of justice, from the House of Lords down to the hedge-schoolmaster, must decide unanimously,—“Punish them all, if they will not confess.” So in other things: secrecy is the rule at Oxford: the assessor of the Vice-Chancellor's Court delivered a very elaborate judgment against the Regius Professor of Divinity in a very important cause: the assessor's judgment was open, in open court: he had a character to lose or to maintain. Upon an appeal, certain delegates, whose bias was tolerably well known, reverse this judgment, without a syllable of comment, without a reason, without a judgment, upon no authority, no precedent, no law, no grounds, upon assigning which alone a further appeal could be sustained. And why?—because they are a body, and therefore have no conscience, no character, no responsibility, no duty. So again in the great Macmullen case, somebody vetoes a degree for some reason, or for no reason, or at some instigation, or at mere caprice; but



whether it was the Vice-Chancellor in this or that capacity, whether at the recommendation, or demand, or compulsion of Dr. Hampden, or of the Regius Professor of Divinity, (for though the two happen to be one, yet they can act irrespectively of each other,) or of somebody else, name, status, and objection alike unknown, so it comes to pass that Mr. Macmullen loses his degree, he can't tell why—at the request of somebody, he can't say who—and he is left to guess for a reason, but he can't say what. So that secrecy being the prevailing sin of Oxford rule at present, because Dr. Symons is committed to this secret and irresponsible despotism, and because we do not know how Dr. Symons acted in a case, where secrecy was the characteristic sin of the whole proceeding, and because Dr. Symons and his six friends still shroud that matter in impenetrable darkness, therefore we may fairly anticipate that when his rule is wider, Dr. Symons will still act upon the same nefarious system. The very *gravamen* of our charge against Dr. Symons is, that we do not know how he acted in the Pusey business; far, then, from this fact influencing us in favour of the Warden of Wadham, as much as anything—perhaps more than anything—it tells against him.

And now a single word on the safflow pretext of Peace: "You are disturbing the peace of the University by opposing Dr. Symons." To which it might be enough to reply, indeed the answer has been already given, that the measure is a purely defensive one; if offence is to come, it comes from those who bring forward, not those who reject, the Warden of Wadham. If principle is always to be sacrificed to peace, peace may certainly be obtained by the Six Doctors, individually and collectively, abstaining from any demand on the suffrages of Convocation: let them for once make a sacrifice for this boasted peace. It is notorious that they have made themselves personally objectionable to a very large and very influential body in Convocation: principles then apart, the fact being indisputable, why should they reopen closing wounds, and revive heats partially allayed, by still challenging attention to themselves? What would be said, for example, were any leading man on the opposite side, who might be very well fitted for the office, to become candidate for the Chair of Moral Philosophy? Conceive, for a moment, what would be said about "marked men," "party views," "extreme opinions," "perilous the peace of the University;" and yet nobody on the one side—and that sides do exist it were folly to affect to dispute—is personally,—i.e. in the way of expressed and decided views,—more objectionable to one school than is Dr. Symons to another: so that, if peace is to be the one aim and the one measure, let Dr. Symons retire, and we shall know how far peace has any meaning. Why is the reciprocity to be so one-sided? Why are

we alone to make sacrifices on this shadowy altar of peace? But, apart from this, is peace, as such, and at any price, to be the object of our Christian striving? Holy Scripture seems to postpone it to something of prior importance: "*First pure, then peaceable,*" is the rule of our walk and the object of our probations: ours is the Church *militant* here on earth. "What hast thou to do with peace?" is the stern question of those who are entrusted with the solemn commission of a divine *νέμεισις*. It is not for nothing that the duty of defending the faith is made a trust; it is not that we may take it up and lay it down when it suits taste or popularity, or to secure smiling faces and a hollow concord; but it is something, for the due discharge of which every member of Convocation will have to answer before the judgment-seat of Christ. Let us put the question in this the plainest way. Is Dr. Symons the man whom we think in any way fit for the Vice-Chancellorship? Should we have nominated him? Do the Statutes give us power to reject him? Because if these things are so, the duty is laid upon us, we have not sought it, to reject the man of whom our conscience does not approve: this was the very emergency for which the Statute provided. To give, as the Statute does, the nomination of Vice-Chancellor to one functionary, and to subject the approval of that nomination to another body, implied that cases might, and provided for the contingency that cases would, arise, where the Chancellor and Convocation might entertain different opinions of an individual's fitness. And why should we escape this emergency when it comes upon us? Because it may perhaps produce difficulties; it may bring on a crisis; it may lead to some result, we are told. Well: what of that? What are we, that we should refuse to act because we know not what will come of it? Are there no such things as ventures? Is Christian Faith extinct? Are we always to count upon ease and quiet, and certainty following everything that we are called upon to do? Are we to do what we know to be just, and right, and true, and fair, only when we are certain that the sun will shine and the world will smile and applaud us? This may be expediency; but it is not the rough path of plain Christian duty: it is not a single-minded grasp of personal accountableness for every thought and word and work.

Besides, this catch-word "peace" has more meanings than one: the Russian Emperor talked of peace, when he said "*tranquillity reigns at Warsaw*;" this was peace of a sort. And there may be peace in Oxford, when every preacher in the University pulpit who believes in the Sacraments is silenced and expelled. The Puritans and Rebels had a happy knack of establishing peace of this sort. Never was such a peaceful time for Oxford as when Oliver Cromwell was its Chancellor. Is this the sort of peace that we wish to restore?

Many and many are the wrongs and aggressions which we

must endure as individuals, which it would be treason not to resist as members of a body politic. The case is, then, one in the nature of a trust: it is not for our own interest that we struggle; but for the interests of those who come after us. Such, in its highest degree, is the nature of our resistance for the Faith: its preservation involves many elements, not alone for ourselves, but also for those who have gone before; for those who have to succeed us.

Nor must it be forgotten that the non-resident M.A.s have peculiar duties towards those at Oxford who are inclined to do their duty, and to fulfil conscientious obligations generously and without regard to consequences alike temporal and local. It is well known that the opposition to Dr. Symons originated with the residents, a body not over-anxious to embroil themselves with authorities, and, for personal reasons, not unduly desirous of victimizing themselves, and making themselves notoriously unpopular, and cutting themselves out from tutorships and other snug things for which members of the Hebdomadal Board are always on the look-out for safe men. If, then, such men as these, who are best acquainted with the personal qualifications of the Heads of Houses, feel it their duty, at whatever cost, to reject Dr. Symons, then surely it does not become men of kindred sentiments, and of influence in other ways, to stand apart from those who so disinterestedly and so nobly have commenced the struggle. The fear of seeming to be a party man, the unwise dread of following truth, whoever pronounces it, has made many a man, otherwise good, surrender his own obligations to duty, only because others have told him of them.

Once more: we hear a vast deal of "respect for authority: this is only a factious move: it resists authority, the Chancellor's authority, and the authority of the Hebdomadal Board." But all these authorities are simply co-ordinate. Let it never be forgotten, that authority is only to be held worthy of respect while it is lawful authority: Nero's *pro tanto* was lawful authority, and therefore St. Paul respected it; if Queen Victoria were to-morrow to enact Nero's part, do we owe the same duties to her? Sir Robert Filmer would not hold this. It is a duty to preserve the University constitution; we ask for no faction fights every October; but we do ask for Vice-Chancellors to do their duty, and to let Convocation do theirs: we ask for the preservation of the old constitution, to sap which Dr. Wynter's rule has done more, and Dr. Symons would do still more, than the silent modifications of centuries. The time has come for a vigorous appeal to old principles: the first opportunity has arrived for the University, in the person of its Convocation, to disavow any share in the persecution of Dr. Pusey, by branding, as solemnly as she can, one of the actors in that flagrant wrong. The opportunity is a providential one: trusts imply duties, as a

clever writer, N. E. S., in the *Churchman* has argued: the Statutes seem to have provided for a case like the present. Let every member of Convocation avail himself of it. One struggle now, and the reign of "Resident Governors" is over: the constitution of Oxford is preserved. Only let us be prepared for every tricky manœuvre to which the sense of impending and deserved punishment can, in its last extremity, have recourse. That it should have been found necessary to issue the subjoined melancholy document is sufficiently distressing:—

"*Oxford, Sept. 23, 1844.*—Members of Convocation are respectfully informed, that the Vice-Chancellor, although requested by the Senior Proctor, has refused to give any information as to the day of the nomination of his Successor. Whether this information will be open to Dr. Symons, members of Convocation may decide for themselves from the events of the past year. At all events, it is to be hoped that they will hold themselves in readiness to come up, on the receipt of a notice of the day, if the discovery of it prove possible; or if not, to show in some other marked way their sense of this fresh act of injustice."

The only miserable ground upon which this information can be refused, is that the Statute (Tit. xvi. Sect. iii. § 1.) only mentions "*Congruum tempus post Comitia*" for reading the Chancellor's letter. However, on the 10th of October, Dr. Wynter, *ipso facto*, is relieved of his office: his successor must be nominated in a Convocation; and with reference to this, the Statute uses the words, "*Indicta Convocatione.*" Some notice must be given; and the Convocation must be on or before the 10th of October.

Of course, if Dr. Wynter withheld the information from the other party it would be fair, though still insulting to the proctors, to say nothing of Convocation. But this is impossible, from the nature of the case. Dr. Symons is a party who must appear when he is nominated, to make a speech, &c.; he therefore has information which is denied to others. This valuable piece of secret intelligence has, without authority, escaped—the Warden's friends make use of it, and we believe that we are safe in stating that the 8th of October will be *the* day. This is a plain attempt at trickery; and if we desired Dr. Wynter's sun to set under the merited obloquy of all honest men, we could not do more than thank him for this last demonstration of himself. It is quite remarkable, yet significant, that Dr. Wynter has thought proper to exercise his expiring sway in an act in which it is a question whether folly or injustice most glaringly obtain. Were we desirous of a new triumph, we could ask for no more certain means of securing it than the shuffle which is playing in concealing the day of nomination.

*The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D. D., late Head Master of Rugby School, and Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford.* By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of University College, Oxford. London: Fellowes. 2 vols. 8vo. 1844.

THIS is a most genuine, hearty, real, and vivid book—most striking, most glowing, and most pictorial. It gives Dr. Arnold to the life, and portrays the man completely. We may say this without professing to have had more than an exoteric knowledge of Dr. Arnold's character, before we read it, to test the likeness by. There is a kind of intuitive power, however, by which we recognise a good portrait even when we did not know the original. Truth and nature tell their own tale: we see when the features are harmonious, when the face is a characteristic one, when the composition is a whole. This book is a clear, full, and rich representation of a particular species of religious mind;—what species we mean, we shall have occasion to explain farther on. We will take Dr. Arnold, for the present, simply as Mr. Stanley lays him before us, without any comments of our own. And we cannot forbear thus early thanking Mr. Stanley most sincerely for the taste and feeling with which he has managed his own editorial part of the business, and for the tact which has enabled him to carry out the representation of Dr. Arnold's character, opinions, and system, in their very strongest light and most ticklish collision with existing parties, and yet to distinguish throughout between loving the warrior and identifying himself with the combat: which has made him combine the most intense feeling for Arnold in the conflict, and as portrayed and developed by it, with a real, though unobtrusive equilibrium as to the sides of the conflict themselves. "*Mallem equidem cum Platone errare quam cum aliis vera sentire,*" he thinks most justly not to be necessary to show the deference of a disciple, and the affection of a son. His neutrality has not thrown the least shade of coldness or insipidity on his portrait, while it has done much to engage the interest of opposite minds in it.

There is a congeniality often between a man's birth-place and his future tastes. The port of West Cowes in the Isle of Wight, then proud and flourishing in all the naval and military stir of the French war, was the birth-place and nurse of the earlier years of Dr. Arnold; and the noise and sight of equipments naval and military, fresh arrivals and departures, weather-beaten visages, wide-spread sails and cocked-hats, gave early a strong geographical and historical turn to his imagination, mixed with a considerable amount of pugnacity; which vented itself in the battles of paper fleets, and the combats of Homeric heroes dramatized from Pope's translation. A genuine love of the sea through life,

and an amusing philosophical form of the true sailor contempt for "landlubbers," was a result of these scenes. The scenery, if scenery it was to be called, of the midland counties, affected him with sensations little short of disgust. "I *must* satisfy," he says, thirty years after, "a physical want in my nature, which craves after the enjoyment of nature, and for nine months in the year can find nothing to satisfy it. I agree with old Keble, that one does not need mountains and lakes for this; the Thames at Laleham—Bagley Wood, and Shotover at Oxford, were quite enough for it. I only know of five counties in England which cannot supply it; and I am unluckily perched down in one of them. These five are Warwick, Northampton, Huntingdon, Cambridge, and Bedford. I should add, perhaps, Rutland, and you cannot name a seventh; for Suffolk, which is otherwise just as bad, has its bit of sea coast."—The age of the Pisistratidæ would certainly have found Arnold one of the "Paralii," or coast party. For a considerable quantity of stupidity which came before him as schoolmaster of Rugby, he would very charitably account for from the circumstance, that the poor boys had been pent up in those plebeian farm-yards of nature, the midland counties, and had never seen the sea. It was a consolatory reflection to him, however, that perhaps they were not quite so mischievous as they would have been with a wilder origin and more spirited natures. The reflection is a true one, and is capable of a large application.

"He was from his earliest years," says his biographer, "exceedingly fond of ballad poetry, which his Winchester schoolfellows used to learn from his repetition before they had seen it in print; and his own compositions as a boy all ran in the same direction. A play of this kind, in which his schoolfellows were introduced as *thé dramatis personæ*, and a long poem of 'Simon de Montfort,' in imitation of Scott's *Marmion*, procured for him at school, by way of distinction from another boy of the same name, the appellation of Poet Arnold. And the earliest specimen of his composition which has been preserved is a little tragedy, written before he was seven years old, on 'Piercy Earl of Northumberland,' suggested apparently by Home's play of Douglas; which, however, contains nothing worthy of notice, except, perhaps, the accuracy of orthography, language, and blank verse metre, in which it is written, and the precise arrangement of the different acts and scenes."—"But he was most remarked for his forwardness in history and geography. His strong power of memory, (which, however, in later years depended mainly on association,) extending to the exact state of the weather on particular days, or the exact words and position of passages which he had not seen for twenty years, showed itself very early and chiefly on these subjects. One of the few recollections which he retained of his father was, that



he received from him, at three years' old, a present of Smollett's History of England, as a reward for the accuracy with which he had gone through the stories connected with the portraits and pictures of the successive reigns; and at the same age he used to sit at his aunt's table arranging his geographical cards, and recognising by their shape, at a glance, the different counties of the dissected map of England."

At Winchester, Russell's Modern Europe, Gibbon, and Mitford, succeeded to the task of feeding his historical cravings. It is remarkable, that when, in his professorial chair, he quoted Dr. Priestley's Lectures on History, it was from his recollection of the book, when he read it at eight years old. The child is father of the man. When we afterwards read of "my friends Herodotus and Livy, that I am reading now for the fiftieth time;" and the geographical zeal with which the editor of Thucydides announces the intelligence of his "six maps, all entirely original," we know where to go back to for his enthusiasm. The native, genuine, and almost poetical ground which the sciences of history and geography occupied in Dr. Arnold's mind, is indeed remarkable. The maps for Thucydides were "Aunt Delafield's cards" over again. There is something very characteristic in the toys and minutiae, the *τὰ ἐσχάρτα*, to use the Aristotelian word, the hobbies of science. Maps were great favourites with Arnold. Maps, with their lines of latitude and longitude, their ridges of mountains, and ruggednesses of coast, are absolute pictures to some minds. They represent the terraqueous globe, and put before us, in one striking and definite shape, the great fact of the human race, and the whole idea of this earthly state. A map is the modern unclassical representative of the goddess Terra, and makes us realize, in the Lucretian sense, the ground on which we stand, the greatness of space, and the solidity of matter.

Arnold came up to Oxford just in time to be one of a clever and high-principled, High-church and Tory set, which was then predominant among the under-graduates of Corpus Christi College. Judge Coleridge gives us his affectionate recollections of it:—

"There was his single-hearted and devout schoolfellow, who early gave up his native land, and devoted himself to the missionary cause in India; the high-souled and imaginative, though somewhat indolent lad, who came to us from Westminster—one bachelor, whose father's connexion with the House of Commons and residence in Palace-yard made him a great authority with us as to the world without, and the statesmen whose speeches he sometimes heard, but we discussed much as if they had been personages in history; and whose remarkable love for historical and geographical research, and his proficiency in it, with his clear judgment, quiet humour, and mildness in communicating information, made him peculiarly attractive to Arnold;—and above all, our senior among the under-graduates, though my junior in years, the author of the Christian Year, who came fresh from the single

teaching of his venerable father, and achieved the highest honours of the University at an age when others frequently are but on her threshold."—Vol. i. pp. 13, 14.

"He was a mere boy," continues Judge Coleridge, "when he first came to us, in appearance as well as in age; but we saw in a very short time that he was quite equal to take his part in the arguments of the common room; and he was, I rather think, admitted by Mr. Cooke at once into his senior class. As he was equal, so was he ready to take part in our discussions: he was fond of conversation on serious matters, and vehement in argument; fearless too in advancing his opinions—which, to say the truth, often startled us a good deal; but he was ingenuous and candid; and though the fearlessness with which, so young as he was, he advanced his opinions might have seemed to betoken presumption, yet the good temper with which he bore retort or rebuke, relieved him from that imputation; he was bold and warm, because so far as his knowledge went he saw very clearly, and he was an ardent lover of truth, but I never saw in him, even then, a grain of vanity or conceit. I have said that some of his opinions startled us a good deal; we were, indeed, for the most part Tories in Church and State, great respecters of things as they were, and not very tolerant of the disposition which he brought with him to question their wisdom. Many and long were the conflicts we had, and with unequal numbers. I think I have seen all the leaders of the common room engaged with him at once, with little order or consideration, as may be supposed, and not always with great scrupulosity as to the fairness of our arguments. This was attended by no loss of regard, and scarcely ever, or seldom, by even momentary loss of temper."—Vol. i. pp. 11, 12.

His Oxford character is summed up in the same graphic way:—

"At the commencement a boy—and at the close retaining, not ungracefully, much of boyish spirits, frolic, and simplicity; in mind vigorous, active, clear-sighted, industrious, and daily accumulating and assimilating treasures of knowledge; not averse to poetry, but delighting rather in dialectics, philosophy, and history, with less of imaginative than reasoning power; in argument bold almost to presumption, and vehement; in temper easily roused to indignation, yet more easily appeased, and entirely free from bitterness; fired, indeed, by what he deemed ungenerous or unjust to others, rather than by any sense of personal wrong; somewhat too little deferential to authority, yet, without any real inconsistency, loving what was good and great in antiquity the more ardently and reverently because it was ancient. A casual or unkind observer might have pronounced him somewhat too pugnacious in conversation, and too positive: I have given, I believe, the true explanation; scarcely any thing would have pained him more than to be convinced that he had been guilty of want of modesty, or of deference where it was justly due; no one thought these virtues of more sacred obligation. In heart, if I can speak with confidence of any of the friends of my youth, I can of his, that it was devout and pure, simple, sincere, affectionate, and faithful."—Vol. i. pp. 22, 23.

The warm-hearted, tender, affectionate, lively, sincere character, soon comes before us in another connexion. Arnold was born to be a *pater-familias*, as well in the mere literal as in the larger sense of the word. He was made for the parental and didactic relationship to others. There is a great difference between first-rate minds on this point. Some have no natural taste or liking for the particular office of influencing minds; their hearts and intellects expand within themselves, spread over the earth air and sea of speculation, and pervade all metaphysical nature, before they definitely take up the notion of impressing their views upon any one being but themselves. The pleasure of getting their views received, seeing them take, and watching their entrance into other minds, is one which they do not feel or appreciate. It is just the reverse with another class: with them the very process of expansion in their own minds takes the form of communication with other minds; and they have no sooner a view at all, than they want to see it out abroad, and doing its work. The very life of an opinion, even as an inward one, is connected in their idea with its external power; and the internal and external go on together. This constitutes perhaps the very soul of the genuine *magister*. The teaching instinct carries a man naturally into what Archbishop Whately has called the heresy of the *οἱ πᾶσι*—into putting himself into the relation of guide and informant to others—into instituting the society and forming the school, or whatever other shape there may be of the active centrality of one mind amongst others.

Arnold became a married man and a tutor as soon as he could well be either, *i. e.* after a very short residence upon his college fellowship. College society, bright and captivating as it was—even Oriel, full of original thinkers as it was—was not the sphere for him: his instinct marked out a more insulated and independent line. He had soon his nucleus about him. He was of the latter class of minds that we have mentioned; and, as he used to say of himself, “could hardly live without tuition.” His boyish vigour and spirits, his intuitive love of communicating and teaching, and the particular class of affectionate feelings which were so strong in him, all fitted him to deal with the young rather than the old, and carried him into the society of his inferiors rather than of his equals. The scene at Laleham soon rose up, under his care, into a perfect little garden and paradise of tutorial and domestic felicity. Children and pupils grew up under his eye; and his own stock of knowledge was rapidly growing too. He had time for his favourite pursuits; he had the full enjoyment of literary activity and literary leisure; and he had a beautiful river and luxuriant scenery to feed his eyes. Many a tutor has had exactly the same scene around him, but very few have been able to enjoy

and appreciate it as Arnold did. And, in the mean time, he was insensibly observing phenomena, and collecting rules relating to his peculiar department. And the growth of a thorough tutorial experience was preparing him for a larger, more systematic, and more conspicuous field for its employment.

The state of Public Schools at this time is pretty well known. We need not say much about them. Any public school man of some fifteen years ago will remember the routine which he went through, what he was taught, and what he was not taught. Good elegant and accurate scholarship was certainly encouraged; and grammar was well hammered into boys' heads. A still larger class of boys caught an air and style from the atmosphere of the place, and learnt gentlemanly manners; and, perhaps, in these traits we have the principal results which the public-school system, as such, aimed at. Many moral and religious boys, doubtless, came every year out of them; but morality and religion were hardly the aims of the system; and the notions of the latitudinarian and political economist respecting the relation of Church and State, had almost found a counterpart in the relation of the master to the boys in our public schools. The instinctive feeling, though it would not have been formally confessed, was, that good scholarship, and not good morals, was the legitimate aim of the schoolmaster, as such: that much as the latter might have rejoiced, as a man, in seeing a good moral and religious tone grow up in his boys, still he had little to do, as a master, with the boys' consciences; that the particular uses of a school was to teach him Greek and Latin, and not religion; and that if the former only was learnt, that was the boy's, and not the schoolmaster's look out. What has the State to do with teaching religion? the political economist triumphantly asks. And what has scholarship to do with religion? was a question which many a good kind of man asked, who had the sincerest respect separately for both. Feeling had certainly changed since the time that the pious Dr. Busby listened with warm and affectionate ears to the prayers of anxious mothers, as they gave up their innocent children into his magisterial, but truly priestly hands. We do not want to institute invidious comparisons; the faults of our public-school teachers have been the faults of the age, and not of the men: and the apparent quixotic position which always attaches to any advance upon an established order of things, is one which literally cannot be carried off by common minds; and which may, therefore, be excusably not attempted by them. The old-fashioned schoolmaster of the 18th century was a useful state instrument for keeping up a gentlemanly and aristocratical standard of education. Methodical, strict, and upon a theory as much as his own inclination pompous, he regarded his office and dignity rather in its official light, as the headship of a depart-

ment, than as involving a living contact with heads and hearts. A stiff barrier of form kept him at a distance from the real minds he had under him, and the abstract school intervened between himself and his scholars. He was a respectable functionary in the service of education, but was rather her bedel, than her champion; and the dignity of the mace quelled the row, and silenced the murmurer, without much aid of the deeper and more refined reverential feelings.

Dr. Arnold was just the man for making an advance upon this old-school system, and an opportunity was given him of doing so. After a nine years' residence at Laleham, in 1828 the head-mastership of Rugby became vacant; he stood for it, and was elected. The genuine strong confidence with which he had inspired his Oxford friends in his talents for such a post, showed itself in their testimonials, and carried all before it. A wave of applause and bright predictions lifted Arnold into his new position; it was generally felt that something would come of it, and that a beginning was made of a great change in our school system, in the mere fact that he was made a head master. He entered upon the work with spirit, zeal, and joyousness, which betokened an efficient future. A few regrets at leaving the quiet scene of Laleham, a little musing over reminiscences of nine pleasant domestic years over; and he was ready for his large task, and longing for it, like a horse for its gallop.—“There will be a great deal to do, I suspect, in every way, when I first enter on my situation; but still, if my health continues, I do not at all dread it, but, on the contrary, look forward to it with much pleasure. I have long since looked upon education as my business in life; and just before I stood for Rugby, I had offered myself as a candidate for the historical professorship at the London University; and had indulged in various dreams of attaching myself to that institution, and trying as far as possible to influence it. In Rugby there is a fairer field.”

In the same tone he writes to Mr. Cornish, while the election was still pending:—

“You have often wanted me to be master at Winchester, so I think you will be glad to hear that I am actually a candidate for Rugby. I was strongly urged to stand, and money tempted me; but I cannot in my heart be sorry to stay where both M. and myself are so entirely happy. If I do get it, I feel as if I could set to work very heartily, and, with God's blessing, I should like to try whether my notions of Christian education are really impracticable; whether our system of public schools has not in it some noble elements which, under the blessing of the Spirit of all holiness and wisdom, might produce fruit even to life eternal. When I think about it thus, I really long to take rod in hand; but when I think of the *πρὸς τὸ τέλος*, the perfect vileness which I must daily contemplate, the certainty

that this can at best be only partially remedied, the irksomeness of "fortemque Gyan fortemque Cloanthum," and the greater form and publicity of the life which we should there lead, when I could no more bathe daily in the clear Thames, nor wear old coats and Russia duck trousers, nor hang on a gallows, nor climb a pole, I grieve to think of the possibility of a change."—Vol. i. p. 72.

A public school was, in fact, just that mixture of the secular and religious which suited his character, and fell in with his theories. The act of bringing religion into common life, and allying, according to his own sense of the word, Church and State, was his beau ideal of Christian efficiency. Church and State, and religion and the world, come over again and again in his letters, as if his mind was never without the image of this coalition; and a school was just such a union in miniature—a little religious polity, or small Church and State; and the schoolmaster a form of the *Rex atque Sacerdos*. Arnold went to Rugby with the determination of making the school religious. In opposition to any separation of scholarship from religion, the aim of the school from that of the boy; he had conceived a leveling of demarcations, a concentration of energies, a union and solution, which fused the whole purposes of a school in one rich mellow religious intellectual glow.

One very remarkable idea especially penetrated his whole mind with respect to the scene he was entering on; and it continued with him throughout, we mean the strong idea of an actual encounter, a fight with evil. The image of a great conflict with evil comes out repeatedly in his thoughts upon school, the state of parties, and the world in general. This is a rare quality of mind. Everybody has, of course, a distinction between right and wrong; but a particular class of warm characters are positively haunted by an image of evil, as a definite bad thing and an enemy; it is ever catching their eye, and is a perpetual mark and butt to let fly their bolts at. The feeling is not necessarily connected with the highest perceptions of truth, or the highest form of character; statesmen and warriors, and many heroes of the world, have had it in their way. It is in its lowest shape, however, a divine impulse. It is the instinct of man, not in his animal, or in his depraved aspect, but simply as man, and as he came from the creating hand. Other animals have their instincts of hatred and enmity; and the human creature has the highest, the hatred of evil.

Arnold had a notion of evil, in a school, as a sort of spreading blot and mercurial poisonous fluid running about everywhere, and infecting, with awful quickness, in so thick a hive of minds. The power that company and crowds give to the bad, in consequence of the cowardice of the good, and the shame which prevents resistance; the tyranny of a bad public opinion, of swagger and fashion, were positive eye-sores to him:—



"I have just had," we find him writing to a friend, "one of those specimens of the evil of boy-nature, which makes me always unwilling to undergo the responsibility of advising any man to send his son to a public school. There has been a system of persecution carried on by the bad against the good, and then, when complaint was made to me, there came fresh persecution on that very account; and divers instances of boys joining in it out of pure cowardice, both physical and moral, when if left to themselves they would have rather shunned it. And the exceedingly small number of boys who can be relied on for active and steady good on these occasions, and the way in which the decent and respectable of ordinary life (Carlyle's 'Shams') are sure on these occasions to swim with the stream, and take part with the evil, makes me strongly feel exemplified what the Scripture says about the strait gate and the wide one,—a view of human nature, which, when looking on human life in its full dress of decencies and civilizations, we are apt, I imagine, to find it hard to realize. But here, in the nakedness of boy-nature, one is quite able to understand how there could not be found so many as even ten righteous in a whole city. And how to meet this evil I really do not know; but to find it thus rife after I have been [so many] years fighting against it, is so sickening, that it is very hard not to throw up the cards in despair, and upset the table."—Vol. i. pp. 161-2.

"At the very sight of a knot of vicious or careless boys gathered together round the great school-fire, it makes me think," he would say, "that I see the devil in the midst of them."—"What I want to see in the school," he says again, "and what I cannot find, is an abhorrence of evil: I always think of the psalm, 'Neither doth he abhor any thing that is evil.'"

A rule which he very soon laid down for himself after his entrance on the office, is a significant one on this subject. He found a general feeling existing abroad, that "so long as a boy kept himself from offences sufficiently enormous to justify expulsion, he had a kind of right to remain in a public school." One of Arnold's first announcements was a set down to this notion—"Till a man learns that the first, second, and third duty of a schoolmaster is to get rid of unpromising subjects, a great public school will never be what it might be, and what it ought to be." He made up his opinion on this point very early in his tutorial career, and he adhered rigidly to it:—"Sending away boys is a necessary and regular part of a good system, not as a punishment to one, but as a protection to others. Undoubtedly it would be a better system if there was no evil; but evil being unavoidable, we are not a jail to keep it in, but a place of education, where we must cast it out, to prevent its taint from spreading."—An educational war with evil was in short pictured upon Arnold's mind, as he entered upon Rugby: his scope was a free, indefinite, and uncircumscribed one; his energies were tasked to the full; and he had to do everything because he had to do good.

There is a method of going to work which shows a man at home with his department. Arnold's plan and scheme for the management of his school was a clear and straightforward one; he selected for his lever and instrument the Sixth Form. The Sixth Form was his prætorian band, and surrounded the head master like the club bearers of the Greek chieftains, and like the body-guard which attends the queen-bee. They were admitted into his confidence, to his most esoteric thoughts; to his favourite and finest theories. The head master saw comparatively little of the rest of the school. Twice a week a lesson was heard, and the forms of the lower boys passed in review at considerable intervals before his eye, to give him the opportunity of seeing that the routine went on properly, and of exercising a superintendence over the labours of the other masters. But he was visible to the mass principally through the veil of the Sixth Form. And, though as open as day, as far as his personal presence went, and constantly seen about in the play-ground; with respect to the school, as such, he leaned considerably to the Persian policy of shutting himself up in his palace: and the Tower Library, where he heard the Sixth Form, apart from the noise of school and the popular eye, was the Ecbatana of Rugby. The political and theoretic liberal was anything but a practical one in his own sphere: and the extent to which he made himself scarce was sometimes remembered with even bitter feeling by boys, who left before they arrived at the stage of intimacy. Still the relations of distance he maintained—his occasional sternness and anger—his "ashy paleness and awful frown," when anything very bad happened, did not on the whole impede, but aid his popularity. He seems to have had the art—a great one with boys, and men too—to show that you don't care for them: that you care *about* them indeed a great deal, but do not care *for* them the least. Arnold had this happy mixture. He did not injure his school-popularity by wishing and aiming for it; the most certain way generally of not getting it. We see both men and boys detecting selfishness even on the tender point of gaining their own affections, and liking a superior the better for not showing it:—"There grew up," says Mr. Stanley, "a deep admiration, partaking largely of the nature of awe; and this softened into a sort of loyalty, which remained even in the closer and more affectionate sympathy of later years."—"I am sure," writes a pupil, who had no personal communications with him whilst at school, and but little afterwards, and who never was in the Sixth Form, "that I do not exaggerate my feelings when I say, that I felt a love and reverence for him as one of quite awful greatness and goodness."

The Sixth Form, then, were Arnold's representatives and delegates in the school, the channel through which his influence was felt, and his wishes known. He concentrated his personal

interest, and all the peculiar feelings of master to disciple, upon them; he upheld their authority in the school with rigour, and he rebuked them the most deeply and indignantly, when they behaved ill. They had the principal honour of his affection and his wrath:—

“I do not choose,” he says, on one occasion, when some vigorous measures in members of the Sixth Form towards the populace of the school had been called in question,—“I do not choose to discuss the thickness of Præpostors’ sticks, or the greater or less blackness of a boy’s bruises, for the amusement of all the readers of the newspapers; nor do I care in the slightest degree about the attacks, if the masters themselves treat them with indifference. If they appear to mind them, or to fear their effect on the school, the apprehension in this, as in many other instances, will be likely to verify itself. For my own part, I confess that I will not condescend to justify the school against attacks, when I believe that it is going on not only not ill, but positively well. Were it really otherwise, I think I should be as sensitive as any one, and very soon give up the concern. But these attacks are merely what I bargained for, so far as they relate to my conduct in the school, because they are directed against points on which my ‘ideas’ were fixed before I came to Rugby, and are only more fixed now: *e.g.* that the authority of the Sixth Form is essential to the good of the school, and is to be upheld through all obstacles from within and from without.”

The fact that the Sixth Form was an instrument ready made for him—their prepositorial authority, as well as the fagging system, having been part of the old school plan, which he found going on when he came to Rugby—does not at all interfere with the credit due to him for converting it into such an instrument of government as he did. He showed the capacity of an able mind in appreciating the materials which his department offered him, and making them serve his turn instead of discovering others. The old-seasoned timber is likely to be stronger, and more serviceable too, than the green planks just cut from the wood. Arnold kept up the old system of the school to an extent extraordinary for a person of his very anti-Tory sentiments. The keen practical insight which his tutorial genius and experience gave him in his own particular department,—the acuteness and solidity of the new schoolmaster, came round to the same point with the prejudices of the old one. Arnold gave life and strength to the machinery already existing, pointed and edged the tool, and turned it into the hole it was meant to cut. The Sixth Form was a definite instrument of his, and was made to act upon the school and reflect himself.

With the same practical view he kept up fagging, and he

kept up flogging. On the latter *exata questio* he was very clear and decided, though making a distinction between big boys and little ones. "I know well," is his criticism on the liberal dislike of that punishment, "of what feeling this is the expression: it originates in that proud notion of personal independence which is neither reasonable nor Christian. . . . At an age when it is almost impossible to find a true manly sense of the degradation of guilt or faults, where is the wisdom of encouraging a fantastic sense of the degradation of personal correction? What can be more false, or more adverse to the simplicity, sobriety, and humbleness of mind, which are the best ornament of youth, and the best promise of a noble manhood?"

And he liked old school associations as well the old school system. Winchester and Oxford were historical places; he desiderated some associations of the ancient sort for Rugby, and felt painfully the contrast between it and Winchester in that respect. In their place, he had a scheme for getting a crown medal for Rugby, to give the school more of an old established aristocratical air. However, he dwelt upon its antiquity, even in spite of these defects:—"There is, or there ought to be," he tells his boys, "something very ennobling in being connected with an establishment at once ancient and magnificent, where all about us, and all the associations belonging to the objects around us, should be great, splendid, and elevating. What an individual ought, and often does, derive from the feeling that he is born of an old and illustrious race, from being familiar, from his childhood, with the walls and trees which speak of the past, no less than of the present, and make both full of images of greatness; this, in an inferior degree, belongs to every member of an ancient and celebrated place of education."

A good, bold, systematic character thus stamped Arnold's whole school-scheme and basis. But his great fort, and secret of influence, after all, was *himself*. The system was nothing without the man: the man was at the bottom of the whole work; and "our great self," the school, was the portrait and impersonation of the master.—"Whatever peculiarity of character was impressed on the scholars whom it sent forth, was derived, not from the genius of the place, but from the genius of the man. Throughout the whole, whether in the school itself, or in its after effects, the one image that we have before us is not Rugby, but Arnold."

To take a look into the Library Tower, and see him at the head of the table, with his class before him. Mr. Stanley gives us the scene from his own vivid recollection, and calls upon his fellow-scholars to—

"remember the glance with which he looked round in the few moments of silence before the lesson began, and which seemed to speak his sense of his own position and of theirs also, as the heads

of a great school ; the attitude in which he stood, turning over the pages of Facciolati's *Lexicon*, or Pole's *Synopsis*, with his eye fixed upon the boy who was pausing to give an answer ; the well-known changes of his voice and manner, so faithfully representing the feeling within ; the pleased look and the cheerful 'Thank you,' which followed upon a successful answer or translation ; the fall of his countenance, with its deepening severity, the stern elevation of the eye-brows, the sudden 'Sit down' which followed upon the reverse ; the courtesy and almost deference to the boys, as to his equals in society, so long as there was nothing to disturb the friendliness of their relation ; the startling earnestness with which he would check in a moment the slightest approach to levity or impertinence ; the confidence with which he addressed them in his half-yearly exhortations ; the expressions of delight with which, when they had been doing well, he would say that it was a constant pleasure to him to come into the library."—Vol. i. p. 126.

" 'You come here,' he said, 'not to read, but to learn how to read ;' and thus the greater part of his instructions were interwoven with the process of their own minds ; there was a continual reference to their thoughts, an acknowledgment that, so far as their information and power of reasoning could take them, they ought to have an opinion of their own ; a working not for, but with the form, as if they were equally interested with himself in making out the meaning of the passage before them ; a constant endeavour to set them right, either by gradually helping them on to a true answer, or by making the answers of the more advanced part of the form serve as a medium, through which his instructions might be communicated to the less advanced part."—Vol. i. p. 127.

The solicitude that boys should apprehend his meaning for themselves, and take it in with their own minds, and not with the master's—a common mistake, by the way, in teaching—this genuine tutorial sympathy established a kind of equality and reciprocity between the master and boys. He never concealed difficulties ; was never afraid of confessing ignorance ; and would appeal for help to the French scholars and Latin verse-writers among the boys. His own books even did not escape ; and, touchy article as a printed book is in the eye of the author, the mistakes in his own *Thucydides* were acknowledged to his class with most creditable candour.

Arnold's warmth of heart was, in short, part, and the most effective part, of his talent. A stream of exuberant feeling carried him along, and carried the school along with him : they were taken off their legs, and found themselves floating and swimming, and enjoying their delicious bathe in the blue sun-shiny lake. Arnold's school was his family : he had an overflowing fund of feeling for pupils, friends, family, and all ; not one set of feelings for one class, and another for another, so much as a fund of large warm and luxuriant affectionateness for all. And this, though entirely sincere, was just of that

easily excitable kind which most tells upon persons, and impresses most vividly. Always ready to bubble up, and find a vent in tone, look, the tremor of the voice, the tear in the eye; it was constantly giving life, warmth, and animation to what he said. Its very uncontrollableness, in the kindly and tender shape which it took, was a pleasing feature about it: persons were quite won over by the liveliness of his emotions, and carried away the little scene which it created, as a tender picture in their minds. He burst into tears on somebody in his own family circle making a comparison, which seemed to place St. Paul above St. John, and begged that the comparison might never again be made. Such a lively unaccountable sally of emotion breaking in upon a religious argument is very characteristic. "He was sometimes so deeply affected in pronouncing sentence on offenders that he could hardly speak. 'I felt,' he said once of some great offence in a sixth-form boy, and his eyes filled with tears as he spoke, 'as if it had been one of my own children.'"—"No thoughts were so bitter to him as those suggested by the innocent faces of little boys, as they first came from home. 'It is a most touching thing to me,' he said once in the hearing of one of his former pupils, on the mention of some new comers, 'to receive a new fellow from his father—when I think what an influence there is in this place for evil, as well as for good. I do not know any thing which affects me more.' His pupil, who had, on his own first coming, been impressed chiefly by the severity of his manner, expressed some surprise, adding, that he should have expected this to wear away with the succession of fresh arrivals. 'No!' he said: 'if ever I could receive a new boy from his father without emotion, I should think it was high time to be off.'"—In administering the Communion he bent himself down to the little boys with looks of fatherly tenderness, and glistening eyes, and trembling voice.

Even every day-school routine and repetition was not dry to him. He was asked whether he did not tire of hearing the same lessons constantly. "No," was his answer: "there is a constant freshness in them; I find something new in them every time I go over them." His "childlike enjoyment of Herodotus," and of "that fountain of beauty and delight," Homer, quite overpowered him. At the hundredth time of hammering it into a class, the story of Cleobis and Bito brought tears to his eyes.

We follow him into his house, and we see his children playing upon his knees, while he writes or reads rapidly in spite of that interruption, and that of constant visitors going in and out. "A stir of so many human beings greets him from morning to evening, that he sometimes feels that he should like to run his head into a hole." He goes into the play-ground, salutes the little boys cheerfully *en passant*, and watches the cricket. He is as fond of



play as any one of them, and only does not climb his gallows in public at Rugby—a treat which he thought he could not as head-master well indulge in. But he looks forward to the deprivation with some degree of gloom from Laleham:—"I want absolute play, like a boy, and neither riding nor walking will make up for my leaping-pole and gallows, and bathing, when the youths used to go with me, and I felt completely for the time a boy as they were," (p. 81.) He was quite the "elder brother and playfellow" of his sons and pupils, but with the superior relation close at hand to fall back on when he thought fit. His pupils at Laleham are his walking, bathing, and jumping companions; and "he calls us fellows!" is the first exclamation of surprise from the little boys that come to Rugby. Moreover, he actually trusted their word; and, "it is a shame to tell Arnold a lie,—he believes one," was the current remark.

Next to children and pupils, his delight is scenery. "The enjoyment of nature is necessary to satisfy a physical want in his nature." The delight of living in mountains, "and seeing and loving them in all their moods," takes him to Westmoreland; and nothing satisfies him but he must actually build a house at Foxhow, some three hundred miles from Rugby, where he retires for the holidays, out of pure love of fine scenery. Warwickshire, "with no hills, either blue or brown, no heath, no woods, no clear streams, no wide plains for lights and shades to play over, no banks for flowers to grow on," is only pleasant for the intellectual and moral enjoyments it supplies in the shape of pupils, which it gives in plenty. But at Foxhow the enjoyment is completed, and comes to a climax. There he has scenery, children, pupils, friends. His favourite boys often accompany him there for the holidays. He is full of invitations to persons to come and see him; and the society of Wordsworth is in keeping with lofty mountains, cataracts, and summer skies. Very fine weather could make even Rugby smile. "The deep green of a field of clover, or an old elm on the rise of a hill, or a fine oak," made him stop and admire; and the sight of "the blue depth of ether" elicited his philosophical preference of the modern idea of the "blue sky" to the "iron firmament" of the ancients. And there were "the happy walks by the side of his wife's poney, huntings for flowers in the fields and hedges, excursions to the neighbouring clay-pit to look for coltsfoot, the mock sieges which followed," and all the fun and cheerfulness of the party.

The peculiarly domestic standard about which all these pleasures and excitements, moral and physical, gathered—the type of the *pater familias* which ran through them, was a thing to be observed. All persons have their whole and centre, to which their tastes and feelings attach. Arnold's whole was the house, the *oikia*, the family. He was domestic from top to toe; his

school a family—his family a school: the family type surmounted and headed the whole scene of his employment and his pleasure. A family was a temple and church with Arnold,—a living sanctuary and focus of religious joy,—a paradise, a heaven upon earth. It was the horn of plenty, the sparkling cup, the grape and the pomegranate, the very cream of human feeling and sentiment, and the very well-spring of spiritual hopes and aspirations. He thought and he taught, and he worked and he played, and he looked at sun, and earth, and sky, with a domestic heart. The horizon of family life mixed with the skyey life above, and the earthly landscape melted, by a quiet process of nature, into the heavenly one.—“‘I do not wonder,’ he said, ‘that it was thought a great misfortune to die childless in old times, when they had not fuller light—it seems so completely wiping a man out of existence.’”—“The anniversaries of domestic events—the passing away of successive generations—the entrance of his sons on the several stages of their education,—struck on the deepest chords of his nature, and made him blend with every prospect of the future the keen sense of the continuance (so to speak) of his own existence in the good and evil fortunes of his children, and to unite the thought of them with the yet more solemn feeling, with which he was at all times wont to regard ‘the blessing’ of ‘a whole house transplanted entire from earth to heaven, without one failure.’”

The feeling extended itself into the past in his mind, and became a genuine patriarchal ancestral taste. “When, in later years, he was left the head of the family, he delighted in gathering round him the remains of his father’s household, and in treasuring up every particular relating to his birth-place and parentage, even to the graves of the older generations of the family in the parish of Lowestoff, and the great willow-tree in his father’s grounds at Slatwoods, from which he transplanted shoots successively to Laleham, to Rugby, and to Foxhow. Every date in the family history, with the alteration of hereditary names, and the changes of their residence, was carefully preserved for his children in his own handwriting; and when, in after years, he fixed on the abode of his old age, in Westmoreland, it was his great delight to regard it as a continuation of his own early home in the Isle of Wight.”—And the vivid affection he entertains for all the scenes of his youth, comes over and over again in his strong Wykemist reminiscences, and in the “poor dear old Oxford, and Bagley Wood, and the pretty field, and the wild stream that flows down between Bullingdon and Cowley Marsh, not forgetting even your old friend, the Lower London Road.”

We have seen Arnold at work, and Arnold at play; but the fact is, play and work were the same thing to him, with respect

to telling upon his happiness. They were the Castor and Pollux, the delightful and happy variation of his existence. It was one down, another up; either he was at work and happy, or he was at play and happy. But work was his chief play, his charming, and most absorbing and satiating excitement: his meat and drink. He hungered for it; he looked forward to it with all the eagerness and sharpness of genuine appetite. Recreation was more pleasant, from the delightful termination it had in prospect, even than on its own account; and he seems to have had the power of taking long camel's draughts of it, which set him going for months, and upon a basis of strength which made no continuity of work a fatigue to him. "It is this entire relaxation, I think, at intervals—such, again, as my foreign tours have afforded, that gives me so keen an appetite for my work at other times, and has enabled me to go through it, not only with no fatigue, but with a sense of absolute pleasure."—His spirit carried him through his long half-years with a swing; and after a long morning's work in school, like the hunter that positively put his master into a rage because he could not be tired, and would come home fresh after the hottest run, he was as vigorous as ever, and ready to set to at his Thucydides, pamphlets, correspondence, or anything else on hand. "‘Instead of feeling my head exhausted,’ he would sometimes say, after the day's business was over, ‘it seems to have quite an eagerness to set to work. I feel as if I could dictate to twenty secretaries at once.’"—"My spirits," he writes, "in themselves, are a great blessing; for, without them, the work would weigh me down, whereas now I seem to throw it off like the fleas from a dog's back, when he shakes himself."—"I do not at all dread it—I look forward to it with much pleasure," is his remark, when a candidate for Rugby, on the immense career of work that he was bringing down upon himself. The retrospect of labour is the pleasantest part of it to most people; the prospect of it was to Arnold. "I have nothing to do with rest here, but labour," he says; and he adds, "I can and do look forward to labour with nothing but satisfaction."

What with work and what with play, in short, what with pupils and children, and scenery and nature; with Thucydides, Herodotus, Livy; Foxhow and the lakes; leaping-pole, gallows, and bathing; above all himself, his activities, feelings, emotions; his inexhaustibleness, perpetual motion, the intense and indomitable principle of life there was in him;—what with his happiness and what with himself, who so thoroughly apprehended and imbibed it—Arnold's happiness made up as overpowering a whole as is often presented in the lot of man. "The very act of existence was an hourly pleasure to him." He dwells upon "the almost *awful* happiness of his domestic life." The "entire happiness that he tastes year after year, and day after day, is

almost *startling*." He "never raises his eyes from the paper to the window without an influx of new delights." The "quiet hourly delight of having mountains and streams as familiar objects, connected with all the enjoyments of home, one's family, one's books, one's friends, associated with our work-day thoughts as well as our gala days—as a vision of beauty from one vacation to another"—represents a particular department of the enjoyment which he imbibed from inanimate nature, and is quite a picture.

Upon the character, of which we have just given a sketch,—and a vigorous, youthful, eager, intense, lively, affectionate, hearty, and powerful character it is,—we have now a remark to make. We find a deficiency—we want a something here. Energetic characters, of all others, need, and should have, the depressing balance in some shape or other; and an indefinite sensation to this effect rises like a vapour out of the rich glow and warmth of such a life as Arnold's.

Is there a Christian form of the dark rough-hewn idea of the old world expressed in the Πᾶν τὸ Θεῖον φθονεῖν, the awful "Divine Envy," the disturbing Genius of this earthly life? A natural instinct, or a remnant of superstition, or something better, puts us on the watch for pain to counterbalance power, and sadness to relieve success; predicts all not right where things are too flowing, misfortune latent where it is not seen; makes fear the test of solidity, and melancholy an element of greatness? The touch which turns to gold, the eye that brightens earth and sky, the life which feeds and satisfies all sweet affections and intellectual activities, encounters this sad comment. Has not the success of the really great been paid for generally, as if by a law of nature, by the sting which has extracted the inward satisfaction of it; by the pressure, burden, cloud, within; the grievance and the sore; the wound deep-seated at the heart, which knew no flattery, and defied the ointment? He who braved it out of doors wept at home, and felt in secret all the languor and depression of feeble nature, while a gallant show of strength and boldness rode over the outside world. This, indeed, is the popular theory of the interesting in epic, drama, and novel; to which even the child's story-book and strolling rustic barn-floor play appeals. It lies at the bottom, if we may say so, of the *science* of romance; and is applied and developed, rudely or with polish, simply or subtly, awkwardly or dexterously, as we may fancy a principle in mechanics, according to the hand it falls into. A hero is one who suffers; man, woman, and child expect it: they think themselves defrauded of their right if he does not: the luxury of pity was the temptation and the attraction. They did not want him to enjoy himself: that perfect harmony of life, and full reception, into the inner man and very heart, of outward nature's

light and glow, makes a brilliant rainbow, but an uninteresting soul. There is one view of character, of course, which does not make this necessary—in which characters interest us as agreeable phenomena, and pleasant combinations, in the way that rich mixtures of colours please the eye. We may see this in many of the delightful characters in works of fiction. With all that is amiable and genuine in them, and which has doubtless a real claim to the interest due to goodness; the charm these characters possess, does seem to approach more or less to the *physical*; and so far as it does, it differs in kind from the one we mean. Moral interest, pure and intrinsic, requires the other, the severer and sadder basis; it does not attach itself to the harmonious image of life: and the pleasurable state, whether sluggish and heavy, or sparkling and vivacious, is exactly not its object. We are speaking of the natural, rough, popular view, which the human mind takes. Pity is akin to love. We are very sorry when our friends are unhappy, but we do not like them less, but more—yes, more—for being so. And large mixture as these popular facts doubtless contain, in the concrete, of caprice, morbid sentiment and nonsense; they betray a principle underneath.

Arnold's character is too luscious, too joyous, too luxuriant, too brimful. The colour is good, but the composition is too rich. Head full, heart full, eyes beaming, affections met, sunshine in the breast, all nature embracing him—here is too much glow of earthly mellowness; too much actual liquid in the light. We do not discern the finest element of interest in Arnold's character; he is too full to want our sympathy, too happy to be interesting. The happy instinct is despotic in him; he cannot help it, but he is always happy, likes everything that he is doing so prodigiously: the tail is wagging: the bird whistles: the cricket chirps. This is not at all necessary in an energetic practical character: it is notorious, that the very foremost of history's heroes have had a great deal of the sombre element in their constitution; and we all like it. In short, a great character of this class must have it, or he loses cast. Arnold is without it: he is amiable and philanthropic, and his philanthropy is hurt and is distressed at times. That is not what we mean. Philanthropy does not touch the centre; does not wound where wounding tells; leaves a man heart-whole, unhumiliated.

Arnold's happiness is made almost part of his religion, from its intensity. "Awful,"—"startling,"—"the very act of existence,"—a sort of deep mysterious language with respect to it, seems to convert the sensation of pleasure into a positive religion, (on the principle that religion is the deepest part of us,) and give the intensity of eternal essence to present life. The light, superficial, transient, interrupted sensation of pleasure only plays upon the skin, and does not appropriate

the man; but the deep, solid, glowing, and constant pleasure of life, cannot be felt without an act of incorporation passing, and pleasure being converted into a spiritual substance, and becoming a man's religion. A religious theory, in short, seems to lurk beneath these outward symptoms; and without grudging Arnold the Elysium of his generous, amiable heart, we will call the theory by its right name. Arnold was a German: his *ἦθος* was that of genuine religious Germanism, and his life a most favourable, but still a real specimen and legitimate development of the Lutheran theory—not the Lutheran *theory* in him, perhaps, so much as the genuine Lutheran instinct, which came round to the same point. Let our readers go to Miss Bremer's novels. They will see a number of characters, drawn in glowing colours, with feeling, sentiment, generosity, simplicity, disinterestedness, the poetical love of nature and of art, and manly power and talent attaching to them. They have all the richness and juiciness of the human heart and intellect about them. But there is an *hiatus* somewhere: they please our mental palate rather than our soul; and a deep sympathy and a moral yearning at the bottom of our nature is left untouched by them. They are the offspring of a religion that naturalizes itself here; garden plants, fairy forms of the Lutheran ether. Lutheranism has its fine as well as its coarse side. It materializes a higher world, and so succeeds in anticipating it: and it is most successful in doing so when it exhibits most of the *spiritual*. Arnold, we say, belongs to this world of character; he is a *religious* specimen of it, but still he belongs to it. The Lutheran and the Catholic systems have been ever, under one form or other, fighting for the possession of man's goodness. His goodness is recipient of either form, and may be refracted into either atmosphere. Arnold's was German and Lutheran.

But we must pursue our history, and take him upon a wider field than we have yet seen him upon. We are afraid the show will not be quite so smiling a one, and we must prepare for the rough side of his character and his pen.

The year 1830 ushered in what was perhaps the most memorable and alarming struggle between the Church and her political and dissenting opponents in this country that had been seen for a century. The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and the Emancipation Bill, carried in the animus in which it was, had so strengthened the hands of the liberal party, that they seemed to have the world before them, and only to have to strike in order to destroy. The Church was naturally the object to which their aim was directed, and all eyes were instantly turned in that direction. A climax seemed to be at hand; the cry was raised; pamphlet and newspaper were loud about her enormous revenues, her antiquated forms, and her state monopolies; the tithes of her rectors, and the baronies of her bishops, church-



rates, and every part of the establishment. Her wealth was exaggerated tenfold, by ten thousand mouths day after day, till people had a kind of magical Oriental notion of it; and the alliance of cupidity with revolutionary zeal threatened to be too strong for any opposition.

A party existed at the same time *in* the Church, who were quite ready to make use of such a hostile outward demonstration, for the purpose of recasting her upon their own model. Their language to the Church was that of favourable and friendly revolutionism. You cannot go on any longer as you are, they said; if you resist, you are sure to be overwhelmed. You must give way, and you had as well do so voluntarily and with a good grace. Take a more liberal and more comprehensive basis, a freer shape and dress. Suit yourself to the age, and keep pace with the progress of opinion. Only put yourself into our hands, and we will refit you in unobjectionable style, as a solid and congenial institution of the age. In other words, they took advantage of the present opportunity to promulgate and commend their own particular theories to the Church; and a Church-reforming party from within began very soon to excite more attention and alarm than the one without.

Arnold had been ripe a long time for such a movement as this, and he naturally took his place in it. He had reached an age when men have generally formed and matured their opinions, if they ever mean to have any; he had withstood the *genius loci* of Oxford, the endearments of High Church and Tory friendships, and the intimacy of one especially, whom to know and to be a liberal was indeed the height of liberalism. He was the fellow-schemer and theorist of the Archbishop of Dublin, the Chevalier Bunsen, and others:—an acute philosophical circle, to whom, however, his peculiar life and brilliancy was a great gain and addition, as a practical stimulus. Here was a great nucleus of power formed. A speculative liberalism had been the growing element for some time, even in Oxford and in Oriel, under the fostering patronage of Dr. Copleston and Dr. Whately's vigorous and argumentative training. There was every look of a rising school, that had its career to come, and a whole chain of youthful anticipations to run through. The formidable test of fashion had shown itself: it was beginning to be fashionable to be a liberal; and the intellectual tide was leaving the Church basis. That Arnold and Dr. Whately had great ideas of their strength, these volumes, we think, show. The old High Church school were partly gone, and partly asleep: the Evangelicals had no ground of their own, from which they might resist liberalism with any effect. There seemed to be an open field to the new reformers, every prospect of the Church falling into their hands in the natural progress of things: and they appear to have looked confidently to this result themselves. The feeling

was much aided by their great opinion of each other; their great expectation of what must be the effects each other's talents would produce. Of the Archbishop of Dublin, Arnold writes, "He is a truly great man, in the highest sense of the word; and if the safety and welfare of the Protestant Church in Ireland depend in any degree on human instruments, none could be found, I verily believe, in the whole empire so likely to maintain it." "In Church matters they (the Whig ministry) have got Whately, and a signal blessing it is they have him to listen to; a man so good and so great," &c. Of the Chevalier Bunsen the same: "In Italy you meet Bunsen, and can now sympathise with the all but idolatry with which I regard him. So beautifully wise, so good, and so noble-minded!" "At this day," he says in the last year of his life, "I could sit at Bunsen's feet, and drink in wisdom with almost intense reverence."

A series of small restless moves at first showed Arnold's zeal and fertility in the cause, more than anything else. The attempts themselves all died in the birth; but his solicitude about the state of things and the crisis that seemed at hand, actually kept him at Rugby for the holidays—a strong evidence of anxiety and excitement for *him*. "I should not like to be away from my post," he says, "if there is likely to be any opening for organizing any attempts at general reform. Heaven and earth are coming together around us.—That *Record* is a true specimen of the party with their infinitely little minds, disputing about 'anise and cummin.'—These are times when the dove can ill spare the addition of the serpent." The first scheme was that of "Tracts, *à-la* Cobbett in point of style, to show people the real state of things." These tracts, or the "Poor Man's Magazine," or "Register," by which names the papers seem to have come out at last, met with a disheartening fate very soon. An article on the Tory party, in the third or fourth number, was thought too sweeping by some, too milk-and-water by others; and Arnold thought it no use going on. "You give a death-blow to my hopes of finding co-operation for the Register," he writes to Dr. Whately; "that very article upon the Tories has been objected to as being too favourable to them, *so what is a man to do?*" He changed his tack, and took to writing in the Sheffield papers; and thought "often of a Warwickshire magazine, to appear monthly, and so escape the stamp duties." A "Comprehensive Christian Commentary" was the call next. "Oh! for your Bible plan, or, at least, for the sanction of your name: I think I see the possibility of a true comprehensive Christian Commentary, keeping back none of the counsel of God, lowering no truth, chilling no lofty or spiritual sentiment, yet neither silly, fanatical, nor sectarian." These moves and feelers but just tickled his energies however, and did not satisfy them. "I cannot get over my

sense of the fearful state of public affairs: is it clean hopeless that the Church will come forward and crave to be allowed to reform itself? . . . I can have no confidence in what would be in men like —, but a deathbed repentance. It can only be done effectually by those who have not, through many a year of fair weather, turned a deaf ear to the voice of reform, and will not be thought only to obey it, because they cannot help it"—*i.e.* by Arnold himself and his friends. His letters are a string of spirited hortatives to his friends on this subject; and nobody is quick and brisk enough to please him. "The ten who were sought for to save Sodom, will be as vainly sought for now." "You are going," he tells Mr. Tucker, on his farewell for India, "from what bids fair to deserve the name of a city of destruction."

This subterranean noise and rumbling did not go on without an explosion; and before long Arnold went off and up into the air, like a rocket, in the shape of a pamphlet, which astonished and astounded his friends, all the world, and lastly himself: we allude to the memorable pamphlet on Church Reform. This was a premature burst for the movement. It scattered, in one fell discharge, the gathered advance and development of a century; and the consequence was, that the explosion ended with itself, and with the flash it made. The pamphlet, however, was a perfect harmonious and natural expression,—the genuine child of Arnold's mind. He threw his whole soul into it; and gave to the world, in one bold leap of authorship, the darling religious theories of a life.

The first was the idea of the Church-State. German religionism has taken two remarkable lines against the Church—one against her corporate character, the other against her doctrines. It has subjected Church to State with one hand, and it has destroyed unity of faith with the other. The German idea of the alliance of Church and State does not make them two independent societies, each on a distinct basis of its own, though acting in union; but merges them both into one common element, and makes one religious incorporation of the two. The result of this is what is called "national life." The State, by becoming religious, *ipso facto* becomes a Church. The king, as the concentration of the power of the community, is the head of the Church-State. The material corporeal State, the constitutional power, wherever residing, is, in fact, made to sit upon and occupy the Church's ground; and all that remains of the Church, after the act of absorption, is the materialised reflection of itself in the absorber and incorporator; the sanctity of the natural-religious sort, which accrues to the State from its usurpation. The tide of divine economy is sucked back again into the earthly vortex: the divine society is humanised. The Church, which was formed out of the original clay of our social humanity, is turned

back into its clay again; and man, after being called by God from the natural into the supernatural bond of union, seems to declare that he prefers the natural, and retraces his steps. The result is, that Christianity so far relapses into the religion of nature, and instead of being the apex and consummation of the natural dispensation, becomes a past and gone experiment; a visionary recollection; a theory, which was tried and did not answer; a cheat, which deluded the world for a time, and the discovery of which now sends the world, made wiser and sharper by it, to rest the more firmly upon her own basis again, and to rely, after the failure of her high-flowing acquaintance, more than ever upon herself. She returns to the pagan theory. Before the Christian Church existed, the *State* was the church: heathen philosophy solemnly recognised it in that character. The Grecian *polis* was a human and divine society at once—its office divine—its descent human. The German system returns to the *polis* again; and well would it be for it, if it could do that simply, and did no worse. But the Rubicon is crossed: nature cannot be what it was before, without being worse than it was before. We cannot be either pagan, or patriarchal, or legal again: those were anticipations, they cannot be results: they were types, they cannot be substances. The man cannot be the child again; the plant the seed; the sculptured marble the native rock again. Time cannot retrograde; the dainty mouthful cannot be retasted; the old world cannot return; nature cannot be bare nature again. Unchristian she may be, but she cannot be classical again: she cannot return to her old eras without decay and dissolution in the act of retrograding. Reaction is fatal: Lot's wife looked back, and she became a pillar of salt. A distinct creation of a Church is undone in returning to the era before the Church; and paganism is no longer itself, but the unnatural fungus upon its own grave—the rotten fruit, and not the ripening seed.

Nevertheless, the ancient theory of a *Church-State* is, as a classical idea, truly captivating. And Arnold's mind had a peculiar leaning toward the classical: he was tenderly alive to that ideal which was the high and philosophical aspiration of his most favourite ages of the world. Greek and Roman history was his delight: he "threw himself with a glow of passionate enthusiasm into the age of Pericles:" with deep veneration into the "institutions, order, and reverence for law, of the Roman republic." "How can I go on with my Roman history?" he said, upon some bad symptoms breaking out among the Rugby boys: "There all is noble and high-minded, and here I find nothing but the reverse." And his classical taste, it is to be observed, especially selected the purely classical or high pagan finish of the old world *as it was*, for his affections to rest on, rather than its rude and elementary yearnings after what it

was not. He liked the historical and picturesque indeed of Homer and Virgil: but poetry was not his point: Herodotus, Thucydides and Livy were his authors: he was historical all over. His whole aim on this head, his "intensely political and national turn of mind, his admiration for the Greek and Roman republics," amounted in him to a relish for the actual politics and moral basis of the Old State as such, to a real fancy and preference for the classical theory, in parts where Christianity had directly superseded it. It is remarkable that that portion of ancient literature which went deepest in its anticipations of Christianity; which, if any such there were in the old world, was indeed a genuine oracular yearning from its very sanctuary, for a higher system; that melodious heathen prelude of the Christian mystery,—Greek Tragedy—was just the portion of it that he did not take to. The life and blood of the classical age, more than its shadows and anticipations, its present more than its future, was the fascination. Such a favourite point as the "Greek union of gymnastics and philosophy," showed the direction of his mind. The tendency is one which is brought out, and developed broadly in the present state of German literature, light and grave. Miss Bremer adopts a pointed classical model, and is a worshipper of nature and Greek statuary: she converts the Swedish salon into an Ionic temple, and floods her domestic ether with all the floral fragrance and refined sensuality of classicalism. Milton, though not a German, adopted the mediæval antiquity of the genuine neologian, viz. pagan mythology. Different minds touch upon the circle at different points; and Arnold had decidedly his point of contact. The neologian attempts of modern times have indeed remarkably coincided with one or other sort of classical *renaissance*. Arnold's mind was fixed on one—the revival of the Grecian *polis*; and the substitution, for the Christian Church, of a Church-State.

Thus fostered and encouraged, this classical Church ideal became the substratum of a positive science of Christian politics—a Christian *ἡ πολιτικὴ*, in Arnold's mind, which gave the centre to every thought and speculation upon religion. It was the point, "round which were gathered not only all his writings, but all his thoughts and actions on social subjects;" and the basis of all "the aspirations which he entertained of what Christianity was intended to effect."—"If rightly applied," he thought, "it would effect far beyond anything which has been yet seen, or is ordinarily conceived, for the moral and social restoration of the world."—"It was the vision which closed the vista of all his speculations; the ideal whole, which might be incorporated part by part into the existing order of society; the ideal end, which each successive age might approach more closely,—its very remoteness only impressing

him more deeply with the conviction of the enormous efforts which must be made to bring all social institutions nearer to it. It was still, in its more practical form, the great idea of which the several parts of his life were so many distinct exemplifications; his sermons—his teaching—his government of the school—his public acts—his own personal character; and to which all his dreams of wider usefulness instinctively turned, from the first faint outline of his hopes in his earliest letters, down to the last evening of his life, when the last thought which he bestowed on the future, was of '*that great work*'"—that great work of his matured experience and wisdom, not Aristotle's, but Arnold's *ἡ πολιτικὴ*, which would base and adjust the Christian Church-State upon a new and final footing.

This ideal of a Church of course utterly unpriested it: and a priest, accordingly, Arnold could not tolerate. The idea of a priest was a real abomination to him, in the strictest sense of the word; it was an image horrible and unclean to his religious eye. To the abstract priest he had very much the sensations felt by the genuine Brahmin towards an impure reptile. He argues characteristically: "The Heraldic or Succession view of the question I can hardly treat gravely: there is something so monstrously profane in making our heavenly inheritance like an earthly estate, to which our pedigree is our title. And really, what is called Succession, is exactly a pedigree, and nothing better; like natural descent, it conveys no moral nobleness,—nay, far less than natural descent; for I am a believer in some transmitted virtue in a good breed, but the Succession notoriously conveys none. The sons of God are not to be born of bloods, (*i. e.* of particular races.)"—He felt, at the bottom of his heart, in short, an utter distance and incongeniality between a priestly religion and his own; and that if his religion was Christianity, the other could not be. He was not one to mince matters in expressing himself, and accordingly, (indeed we do not see how he could do otherwise,) he pronounced the idea of a priesthood to be positively "Antichristian;" a real *bona fide* form of "Antichrist." The "priesthood, the Sacraments, the Apostolical succession," were his "heresy," his "idolatry," his "schism and his anarchy." He had his idea of the Christian system in his mind; and the priestly distinction was a positive break up to it: it made two where he made one: it undid a whole: it destroyed the visible form of Christianity in the world, as he pictured it. The form of the "religious State," to him, answered to the form of the Catholic Church to others: and the departure from this form was his schism. "Priestcraft," and "Priestcraft Antichrist," "the essence of all that was evil in Popery," "the idolatry of the Priesthood as bad as the idolatry of Jupiter," "the Church's worst enemy," "the false Church:"—most copiously express



the entire contrariety he felt between his own principle of State Christianity, and that of Church Christianity.

It was of course strictly necessary, with such a theory as this, that he should be prepared to unchristianize the whole framework of the Christian society from the first; and Arnold did not shrink from the conclusion. That he wanted "something truer and deeper than what satisfied, not the last century, but the last seventeen centuries," was a mild expression of his view. It was with the fact full before him of a priestly-governed Church of eighteen hundred years' standing, that he pronounced "a priestly government transmitted by a mystical succession from the Apostles" to be "the great Antichristian Apostasy," "the deadly Apostasy which St. Paul in his life-time saw threatening."

The very first era and movement indeed in the Church, from its commencement downwards, which he rested upon with satisfaction as affording any home for his principles, was the Reformation in the sixteenth century: and of the Reformation accordingly, both English and foreign, he was a most ardent, affectionate, loyal, devoted, enthusiastic and genuine disciple admirer and son. He looked up to the Reformation as the first step that was made on the great point of State supremacy. There he saw the first dawn of a new order of things, the first blow struck to priestcraft, the first breath in the total absorption of the Church into the State. He disliked and condemned the individual instruments by which it was effected, the motives on which many acted, and the coarse and violent proceedings which accompanied it. But the movement, as such, had his unfeigned admiration and adhesion: the principle on which it was based, and which it set going, appealed to his very deepest religious sympathies and heartfelt aspirations. He saw, in the rude usurpation of a tyrannical king, the first stone laid of his Church-State; and the precedents of King Edward VI. were the sacred model upon which, with jealous and loyal accuracy, he moulded the whole relations of Church and State in a country. They made the king the head of the Church; and that, in principle, gave him all that he wanted: it only remained to consolidate and fill up the system which had been but just sketched in the outline, and then left; and to develop a principle which an intervening reaction in the Church had stopped and thrown back. "The statutes passed about the Church in Henry VIII.'s and Edward VI.'s reigns, are still the ἀρχαὶ of its constitution," he writes, "if that may be said to have a constitution which never was constituted, but was left as avowedly unfinished as Cologne Cathedral." "The idea of my life," he says emphatically, "to which I think every thought of my mind more or less tends, is the perfecting the idea of the Edward VI. Reformers." He lamented that "a female reign

was an unfavourable time for pressing strongly the doctrine of the Crown's supremacy." But "a doctrine vouchsafed to our Church by so rare and mere a blessing of God, which contained the true and perfect idea of a Christian Church—this peculiar blessing of our Church constitution" he did hope would ultimately "work out a full development."

It is remarkable, too, that with that peculiar acumen which a man has in detecting any attack upon a favourite theory, that critical sensitiveness which he feels for what is part of himself, and by which he recognises a real blow and stroke, which, under any circuitous process, hits the mark and comes home—Arnold discerned in those times, which an ordinary mind would select as specially exemplifying the Church and State principle, the most positive reaction against it. He connects the Caroline era with the revival of the principle of Church independence, and the power of the priesthood; and he says—"viewing the Church of England as opposing the good old cause, I bear it no affection; viewing it as a great reformed institution, and as *proclaiming the king's supremacy*," &c. &c., he feels quite differently. He says the principle on which Archbishop Laud and his followers went, was "to reactuate the idea of a Church;" and that by the Church they meant "the clergy—the hierarchy exclusively." He mistakes them indeed here, but the mistake does not give the picture a more State colouring, but the reverse. So, again, on the subject of Church doctrine in general, he says: "Historically, our Prayer Book exhibits the opinions of two very different parties—King Edward's Reformers, and the High Churchmen of James I.'s time and of 1661; no man who heartily likes the one could approve entirely of what has been done by the other." The distinction is repeated over and over again; and much in the same way in which he regards the whole Catholic Church as a departure from the first, from the Apostolical system, he also regards the career of the English Church as a departure from the genuine principle of the Reformation. "From *Elizabeth's* time, downwards," he says, (a pretty early reverse of his bright side of the Church) "the clergy have been politically a party in the country, and a party opposed to the cause, which, in the main, has been the cause of improvement." Even ordinary, commonplace High Churchmanship, the lowest average Church principle among us, he carefully parts off from any Reformation connexion. And the two parties in our Church have their respective shares in it thus apportioned to them: "The High Church party idolize things as they are: the Evangelicals idolize the early Reformers"—idolize, he means, as distinct from outstripping them, as he himself wanted to do. Arnold saw, we say, that his and the Reformers' movement had been stopped by an intervening school, and that the Church's actual career had been more or less a reaction upon it.

And this distinction gives us the clue to a good deal of Arnold's language about the English Church, when he speaks of her as a "motley" one, with much of good about it, and much of evil; and reprobates an over-fondness for "our dear mother the panther." The language in itself might proceed either from a discontented Catholic, or a discontented liberal; from one who saw too little catholicity in the Church, or one who saw too much. It is evident that, in his case, it is spoken in the latter character. The Church of the Reformation, as such, he liked. That particular spot in her history, the focus of Edward the Sixth's religionism, he thoroughly liked; and all but that he disliked. He liked the Church of England so far as it verged on the latitudinarian and state principle; he disliked it so far as it retained the dogmatic and the priestly one. He aimed at thoroughly expanding the former, and entirely extinguishing the latter. The most flourishing portions of her history to him, were just those which her catholic son looks back to with the greatest shame and sorrow. He especially selects the Georgian period of latitudinarianism and state servility as a "noble exception" to the Church's general character, and a bright contrast to the unpleasant Laudian shades that have too much overspread her history. He lays his sharp finger on the shoots of the Reformation wherever they peep up to light; and he treasures them as earnest of a gladder day, when the Church shall be indeed thoroughly reformed on the Edward VI. model, and the dawning brightness of the sixteenth century become one flood of light over her.

We turn from the ecclesiastical to the doctrinal side of Arnold's system, and of the Church Reform pamphlet.

Arnold's notion of belief was the completely individualist one; there was no connexion with the social principle in it. It clung to no church or sect, to no corporate mass or body of opinions whatever. Most persons, whether they are Churchmen or Dissenters, are, in some sort, *social* in their belief. A man likes a chief point or two in Methodism; and he forthwith not only takes these, but swallows all the others for the sake of company: he adopts, that is, not only one or two Methodist opinions, but Methodism; he becomes a Methodist. He feels one part, and he takes the rest on trust. A society is faith's body; she does not feel herself alive except she is embodied. A mass communicates its own solidity. The Wesleyan bosom lodges the Conference. A Quaker's faith reflects his garb in combination. Man supplies the conscious deficiency in his own apprehension, by an appropriation of his neighbour's; he throws the social mass, good stone or rubbish as it may be, into the spiritual vacuum in his own mind; and then, what with himself and what with others, he feels himself full, and he believes. He extends over a sect, he covers so much actual ground, and is

satisfied. It may not be a very large one, but, as one of the company, he is at home there, and he feels his right: his belief is his regular property, like his farm or estate: he is content to bargain for a little narrowness, if he can have the feeling of solidity; to be straightlaced, and keep within the bounds of his sect, if he can feel what there is there his own. This is the *corporate* principle of belief. The ordinary sectarian, though he *is* one, likes belonging to a body. His faith is social. Individualist belief, on the other hand, prefers space and freedom to solidity; puts its foot every where, and is at home nowhere; picks out of every system just what it likes, and leaves just what it likes; combines all its spoils in some kaleidoscope pattern, and makes that its system. The slender packthread work straggles over the universe in skeleton fashion, touching and dotting where it goes; but including no territory, delineating no form. Sectarianism is narrow, but eclecticism is shadowy and unreal. And to throw oneself into some whole system, and be a Methodist, or a Quaker, has as much largeness about it after all, as their philosophy, who pick only what suits themselves; who only look over the world to discover the scattered images and reflections of the particular ideas which the chance or chaos of individual life has thrown up within their own minds; who are satisfied with the richness of their own internal soil, and who go on, never really enlarging their minds, but only illustrating them. The *reason* of eclecticism's choice is a narrow, though the *field* of it may be a wide one.

Arnold was a strong example of the latter class. His religious tastes extended far and wide, and had their spot and point they touched on in every religious body. He felt in himself a centrality, which seemed to prove the feasibility of centralization for all these bodies, and he wished to bring them all together. One large wall of circumvallation was to include them all. His very idea of religious unity took this form, and unity with him was not so much a corporate as a federal one,—not so much different individuals uniting in one body, as different distinct bodies in one large alliance. Independents and Methodists, Quakers, Baptists, Churchmen, were brought all together upon a common basis, and included in one national Church. He united, in short, his own favourite idea of a State-Church, with the more ordinary latitudinarian one of a union of creeds.

One difficulty there was, indeed, not of theory, but of practice, which appeared to touch him now on the subject of Church and State. It arose out of a comparatively insignificant corner of the national material. All the Christian denominations were members, of course, of the Church; and as such, of the State; the identification of Church and State fully met their case. But what was to be done with the Jews? The broadest ecclesiastical

basis could not include them: they were out of the Church, and therefore out of the State too: not Christians, and therefore not citizens. "I must petition," he writes to Mr. Hare, "against the Jew Bill, and wish that you, or some man like you, would expose that low Jacobinical notion of citizenship, that a man acquires a right to it by the accident of his being littered *inter quatuor maria*, or because he pays taxes. I wish I had the knowledge and the time to state fully the ancient system of *πόροικοι*, *μέτοικοι*, &c., and the principle on which it rested; that different races have different νόμια, and that an indiscriminate mixture breeds a perfect '*colluzio omnium rerum*.'" He was anxious, at the same time, to make as ample amends to the excluded race as could be made, in consistency with the State ideal. And having secured the State's total abrogation of Judaism, he could afford to temper justice with mercy. He admitted the Jews to the rights of marriage, and of domestic life, though not to the supreme order of political rights. "I would give the Jews the honorary citizenship which was so often given by the Romans,—i. e. the private rights of citizens, *jus commercii* et *jus connubii*,—but not the public rights, *jus suffragii* and *jus honorum*. But then, according to our barbarian feudal notions, the *jus commercii* involves the *jus suffragii*." The barbarous mixture, however, of the two rights, commercial and suffragial, though feudal in origin, was not likely to be disturbed by the predominant feeling of the present age; and Arnold advocated some systematic encouragement of the Jews to emigrate.

We have come to the subject of doctrine. He had the ordinary latitudinarian theory here. He thought that "doctrine, in its practical and religious side, as bearing on religious feeling and character, not doctrine, in the sense of a direct disclosure of spiritual or material essences as they are in themselves, was all that could be found in the teaching of Scripture." This rationalist, or private judgment theory of the interpretation of Scripture, is so well known and so common now, that we need not dwell upon it. Arnold wanted every individual and sect to draw their own conclusions for themselves, without censuring or separating from each other, if they come to different ones. We are afraid we even see (and we mention it now we are on the subject,) a tendency in him—we will not call it more—to a still lower stage of rationalism. The form which the rationalistic theory has assumed in this country has allowed any unworthy or defective application of the Bible language, and sanctioned every religion which professes to be gathered from it. It has destroyed the one grand sense of Scripture, but there it has generally stopped: it has abstained from interference with the text itself; and the career of doubt and inquiry has not yet thrust home to

the historical substance and matter of the sacred volume. The Germans have outstripped both their English and Genevan friends, and done this. They have crossed the boundary, and asked the awful question, What is the Bible? What does inspired writing mean? And distinction upon distinction, as to the sense in which, and the degree in which, the Bible, or different parts of it, are inspired, have led to a separation of the earthly and human from the spiritual particles, and into an analytical breaking up and solution of the mass, of which it is impossible to tell the consequences. The comparative escape of this country from the analytical contagion, is a matter of daily and hourly increasing, though thankful, surprise to us. We can hardly dare to face, or to contemplate to its full extent, the anomaly of the unhesitating, literal, dead assent of such an age as the present, to the authenticity and infallibility of such a book as the Bible,—a book so *prima facie* legendary and mystical as the Bible must to this age's philosophy appear. One thinks, naturally, why be at so much trouble at explaining away?—why keep what you are always running against, and endure the perpetual difficulty of squaring to modern views the old structure of supernaturalism? Why encounter the crooked corners of the old mysterious labyrinth, when with one breath you might have an open area in its place?

We do observe *tendencies*, however, in Arnold, towards undermining this entire assent we speak of,—a suspicious liking for distinctions in inspiration, as a subject of speculation that his mind fed upon. Physical science is not taught in Scripture; then why should history be? It is quite possible to deny the historical inspiration, retaining the spiritual, which is all we have to do with. "He had a wonderful discernment," says Mr. Price, "for the divine, as incorporated in the human element of Scripture; and the recognition of these two separate and most distinct elements,—the careful separation of the two, so that each shall be subject to its own laws, and determined on its own principles,—was the foundation, the grand characteristic principle of his Exegesis." And this view of Scripture was "of slow and mature growth" in him. Having begun with, and "intended once to have preached a University sermon in favour of the verbal inspiration of Scripture," his mind developed slowly and steadily against the verbal inspiration. He had a peculiar wish to take up this line as an author. "He had a sharp struggle to choose between the interpretation of Scripture and the Roman history; and his choice was determined, not by the consideration of his peculiar talent, but by a regard to extrinsic matters, the unripeness of England for a free and unfettered discussion of scriptural exegesis."—Is it a part of this theory, that he appears to be so ready on one occasion to throw aside some particular chapters in the Bible which do not happen to harmonize with a



view of his on prophecy? "I have long, he says, thought that the greater part of the book of Daniel is most certainly a very late work, of the time of the Maccabees; and the pretended prophecy about the kings of Grecia and Persia, and of the North and South, is mere history, like the poetical prophecies in Virgil and elsewhere." His reason is—"Those chapters, if genuine, would be a clear exception to my canon of interpretation, as there can be no reasonable spiritual meaning made out of the kings of the North and South." But we will not pursue this more esoteric line of rationalism in him farther.

Arnold had constructed his great national church of all denominations—including both churchmen, and all that are called "*orthodox dissenters*:" but then came the delicate question as to the admission of some to whom the title of orthodox was not allowed. Were Unitarians to be admitted or not? In spite of the haziness and perplexity of Arnold's whole state of mind and point of view on the subject of Unitarianism, so far is clear, that he had no objection to including sincere and earnest Unitarians in his church. And he arrives at this conclusion by the following process—a most painful one for us to follow; because, say it we must, it puts Arnold's own individual belief on this doctrine in a most unsatisfactory light.

We take his letter to Mr. Smith of Norwich. Mr. Smith had written to complain of him for making the act of "addressing Christ as an object of worship" essential in his scheme of comprehension. Arnold, in reply, explains what that phrase of Christ being an object of worship means, in his view.

Does he say that it necessarily means addressing Christ as God? He does not. He says that common Unitarians make Christ virtually *dead*, and that they ought to think of him as *alive*. That is not the same with thinking him God. Again, he says the fault of the Unitarians is, that they approach God "in his own incomprehensible essence;" whereas they ought to approach him through Christ: and that, whereas a direct communion with God is reserved for a more spiritual state of being hereafter, they anticipate it here. Here the fault of the Unitarians is referred to the *mode* of worship only—not to the *object* of it; and they are blamed, not for refusing to regard Christ as God, but for refusing to regard him as the medium through which God is worshipped. And so far from there being an essential and eternal difference in the two relations to Christ,—which the Unitarian and orthodox side respectively suppose,—he distinctly intimates that the very relation to him which the orthodox side supposes, is only a function of our present earthly state of existence, and will not continue in our future spiritual one. A most painful expression of doctrine, by which he identifies the incomprehensible God with God the Father, ("God the Father, *that is*, God as he is in himself,") concentrates but too clearly the

line of idea throughout; viz. that the Unitarians and the orthodox, having both the same Being before their minds as the object of worship, only approach him in different ways, the mediate and immediate; that there is, therefore, no fundamental difference in their respective doctrines, and that such worship as we pay to Christ, as being the medium of the worship we pay to God,—worship *in this sense* to Christ,—is not inconsistent in principle with the creed of Unitarians, and need not be objected to by them.

The question, in short, with Arnold was one of feeling, not of doctrine; and regarded the affection of the man to the Being, and not the essence of Being himself. It is not easy, indeed, to see how the two can be separated; for our feeling towards a being must be affected by the consideration of what that being is. But we state the view as he seems to hold it: "The feelings," he says, "with which we regard Christ are of much greater importance than the question of his humanity or proper divinity." And if Unitarians would think of him as *alive*, and would love and fear him, whether they thought him man or God, he regards them as true Christians. The word "fear" comes in strangely: "I never meant to deny the name of Christian to those who love and *fear* him." Religious fear is a feeling which applies ultimately to the Divine Being alone; and the notion of the "fear" of Christ going along with the simply human idea of him is a perplexing one. Indeed, in the general tone of Arnold's mind on this subject, we see no cold Unitarianism, but what might be taken for the vague foreshadowings of high uninstructed nature: and it is melancholy to see what would have delighted us so much as an aspiration toward revelation, thrown into such a different aspect by the fact of its being a relapse from it. What are we to think when Arnold could say what he did, and yet absolutely imagine that he thought the "central truth of Christianity was the doctrine of our Lord's divinity." We can only suppose that he partly did not know what his own view was, and partly did not know what the doctrine was. "There was a vividness and tenderness," we are told, "in his conception of our Lord, which made all his feelings of human friendship and affection, all his range of historical interest—his instincts of reverence, his admiration of truth—fasten on Him as their natural object." "He seemed," says one, "to have the freshest view of our Lord's life and death that I ever knew a man to possess. His rich mind filled up the naked outline of the Gospel history;—it was to him the most interesting *fact* that had ever happened,—as real, as *exciting* (if I may use the expression) as any recent event in modern history of which the actual effects are visible." We must own we look fearfully on the richness and warmth of that feeling toward our Lord, which could tolerate the Unitarian view of them.

A latitudinarianism, however, which embraced all sects, even the Unitarians, could gather also from Catholicism. Arnold ornamented and enriched his system with not a few flowers and external beauties of Catholic worship, its striking ceremonies and symbols, and even its institutions. With a philosophical dislike and contempt for metaphysical "questions between Homoiousians and Homoiousians" ready to fall any moment from his pen, he yet regarded the creeds "as triumphant hymns of thanksgiving;" and the very Nicene creed of the Homousion was chanted, instead of being read, in Rugby Chapel, at his own especial wish; and had imparted to it the sacred musical pomp which symbolized the deep dogmatic faith of the Catholic Church. He was for crosses and way-side oratories, daily services, religious societies of females, "commemorations of holy men of all times and countries," and religious processions. The former would have included "Catholics, Arians, Romanists, Protestants, Churchmen, and Dissenters." The processions would have consisted of all the denominations. He was for confession, but not to a minister. Having extracted the Catholic and sacerdotal sting out of Church forms and institutions, his taste loved the beauty, and his common-sense the evident utility, of the exterior.

He carries on, we must observe, the same character into the political and poetical department: he is for the same mixture here. He is a vivid admirer of the picturesque, and likes the prestige of antiquity,—the churchyard at Oxford and Winchester, and the pedigree associations of Lowestoff,—but the feudal nauseates him. It makes him ill to see an old castle. The visible demolition of the French castles is the feast of his eyes in his French tour. A great charm of the Westmoreland lakes is that there are no feudal remains there to disturb him. He thinks Chivalry an Antichrist; but then he does not like Jacobinism: he thinks Jacobinism an Antichrist too. The three glorious days, however, were a "blessed revolution; beyond all example pure and heroic." He subscribes to the monument of those who fell. It is difficult to analyze; but we think it is this want of the old poetical associations of which the order and rank are here deprived; that we do not like that reference to the "gentlemanly" which he is rather fond of, and which does not, somehow, come with grace from him. He exhorts his boys to be "Christian gentlemen;" and he wants an undermaster who must be a "Christian gentleman." We would rather see this combination implied than expressed. Expressed in this way, it seems to have a lowering influence on both characters—to tend to secularize the Christian, and to puritanize the gentleman. There was a book published some years ago called "The Portraiture of a Christian Gentleman." Arnold was a mixture in nature as well as religion.

The reader has been put in possession of Arnold's system, ecclesiastical and doctrinal, to the best of our power; and we have only to tell him now that he has been going through, in the last pages, what constituted the substance and matter of the Church-reform pamphlet. That pamphlet was a clear, striking, and utterly fearless exposition of these great theories, without concealment or reserve. The entire fulness of the author's own conviction, which armed them in his own idea, with the almost transparent self-evident irresistible force of truth, made disguise unnecessary: and the scheme of a national Church, to comprehend all sects, and to be under the control of civil functionaries, whether by the name of bishop, or any other, was, with the most ardent seriousness, submitted for *bona fide* acceptance to the Church and nation.

The effect of the burst was what might have been expected. The whole religious feeling of the country was roused and up in arms instantaneously against the aggression. All who had any vestige of Church instinct, all even who had any definite creed of their own, who thought themselves right and others wrong — Churchmen and "orthodox Dissenters" alike were astonished at this bold leap of latitudinarianism. Different persuasions were not prepared for the idea of finding themselves all together within the same walls. And even moderate, lax Churchmen, were taken aback at the prospect of officers in the army and navy administering the sacraments—for the pamphlet went the full length of the author's own conversational illustration of his principle. The theory had in fact come out before its time; it was not a development, but a burst; the hypothetical work of a century was anticipated in it. It was full-blown mature Germanism, as a century of favourable growth would have made it, only put to the beginning of the period instead of to the end. The cart was put before the horse; the building was begun at the frieze and cornice, up in the air, and the unnatural suspension could do nothing but come down. Aladdin's palace, the *polis*, the Utopia of Lutheranism, the reign of feeling over creeds, was an airy creation of magic, and not *terra firma*, so early. Never was there such an imprudent step, to speak politically of it, as a premature exposure, which only reflected, in the repulsive form of their ultimate development, the tendencies which were yet in the bud. The age started back at the exaggerated likeness of itself, and the Church, we trust, took warning. It was an impolitic disclosure. What Arnold should have done was to wait ten years; and then construct, not a Reform pamphlet, but a Jerusalem Bishopric. That would have been wise caution; that would have been natural growth. His friend and fellow-theorist, the Chevalier Bunsen, has shown himself a less complete thinker perhaps, but a more practical manager. Mr.

Stanley has alluded to the parallelism here with Arnold's view. He had a perfect right to do so.

His own friends remonstrated. We have a reply to a letter from Dr. Hawkins, a theologian professedly not of the deepest Church stamp, who, it appears, had passed sentence upon it, and passed it in a more *ex cathedra* style than the author thought quite legitimate. "You write with haste and without consideration," says Dr. Hawkins; "you write on subjects which you have not studied and do not understand, and which are not of your province." This, we must observe, is an unfortunate line of censure to take, because it simply subjects the censurer to immediate contradiction upon a matter of fact, without possibility of reply;—a contradiction which, accordingly, Arnold gives flatly. "You cannot possibly know that I wrote in haste, or that I have not studied the question. I have read very largely about it, and thought about it habitually for several years." It is not, in fact, an appropriate line of objection to urge to the fundamental, the heartfelt, the primary idea of an enthusiastic religionist,—that which has given the colour to all his thinking and reading,—to tell him to go to his books again. He *may* go to his books again; and the only result will be, that his additional reading will be coloured by the same primary idea which coloured his reading before. Let the idea be ever so extravagant, this only makes the case the clearer. To have told the founder of Mahometanism, for example, that "he had not studied the subject," and "that he acted with haste, and without consideration," would have been simply not to the purpose; he would have answered, of course, that he had studied the subject, and thought about it a great deal; and that all his speculation had confirmed the idea with which he started. All enthusiastic promulgators of theories and systems say this; and they say it correctly. Arnold had thought and had read about his subject a great deal, and these two volumes show it. To imagine that all error springs from not "studying" the question, and that if the question "is studied," the mind will right itself; to make the perception of truth the mechanical result of information and inquiry, is an assumption which in multitudes of cases, only diverts attention from the real source of the evil. The fact, however, of such a criticism from such a quarter, showed strongly the unripeness of moderate contemporary latitudinarianism for the contents of the Church-reform pamphlet. Arnold sounded his trumpet, and then found himself standing alone; the blast had alarmed, or had shocked, or had fretted and annoyed respectively the whole English world. The pamphlet was stranded, and the very clearest and most copious evidence was given him, in the shape of criticism, public and private, in good taste and in bad taste, that society did not go along with him.

Arnold now showed a deficiency, a decidedly weak point in

his mind. He stood the shock without giving way, indeed, an inch—nobody would expect him to do that—but he stood it also without understanding or appreciating it the least. He showed a complete want of sympathy and experience in his way of taking these demonstrations.

With the whole world out of breath at his proposed scheme, he stood as innocent and unconscious of having given offence to any one's notions as if he had proposed a new vestry act. He was quite hurt, perplexed, surprised, that people actually thought him a latitudinarian. He could not understand it; could not see what people meant. Latitudinarianism was just what of all things he disliked. He wished, indeed, Churchmen, Independents, Baptists, Quakers, and the good sort of Socinians, to be all comprehended in his church system; but was that latitudinarianism? Could any one be so blinded by prepossession as really to imagine that there was any latitudinarianism involved in such an arrangement? "It grieves him to find that some of his own friends consider the *tendency* of his Church-reform plan to be latitudinarian." Even this modified apprehension, and accompanied with the most courteous confidence in the absence of any such "*intention*" on his part, is unintelligible to him. Far from indicating any latitudinarian intention—how even any incidental undesigned consequences of that nature could, in the chances of things, shoot up from such a scheme, he cannot divine. "My belief," he says, "is, that it would have precisely the contrary effect." "If we were *only* to cut away articles, and alter the Liturgy, the effect might be latitudinarian; but if, while relaxing the *theoretical* band, we were to tighten the *practical* one, then, I do believe, the fruit would be Christian union." That is to say, he embraces the full recognised latitudinarian idea of "practical" union amidst "theoretical," *i.e.* doctrinal differences; and this idea presents itself to him as just the *opposite* of latitudinarianism. This is his notion of latitudinarianism and its contrary, and he has no clue for discovering by what process of mind in other people their idea is just the reverse. He does not apprehend their view or mode of thinking on the subject the least, and therefore not their objections. The whole demonstration against his pamphlet is a dead wall to him; he looks hard, and sees nothing. His own conclusions are so absolutely transparent to himself. "I was not prepared," he says, "to find men so startled at principles which have long appeared to me to follow necessarily from a careful study of the New Testament." And he proceeds accordingly to account—as account, in some way or other, he must—for the feeling against his scheme, by attributing it to hostility and prejudice toward himself. He says, "It is painful to think that these exaggerations, in too many instances, cannot be innocent: in Oxford there is an absolute ἐγαστήριον ψευδῶν, whose activity is surprising;"



and he talks of the "constant and persevering falsehoods" which are circulated about him. The class of martyr feelings follows. "If we oppose any prevailing opinion or habit of the day, the fruit of a life's labour, as far as earth is concerned, are presently sacrificed; we are reviled instead of respected;" and "every word and action of our lives misrepresented and condemned."

A more or less vague public opinion has been Arnold's antagonist and judge hitherto; but a more formidable opponent now comes upon the scene. A mere present state of feeling, a present impression in society, is not an insuperable barrier to the influence of a very active mind. Men start at opinions at first, and afterwards take to them. The Church-reform pamphlet was sufficiently stranded at the time; but many a rock that has been left as much stranded as that, has waited, and gathered the tide about it again; and the waves of an ocean have played over its head. The opposition of conventional feeling, of the noise of numbers, was not perhaps one in itself to have stopped and driven back Arnold's religious theory. That Church and State are one thing, and one thing only, is a definite idea; that of the union of hearts is a broad one. A positive downright theory of Church and State, a positive downright theory of Church union, cuts its way through a mass of opposition that has no definite weapon to oppose to it. An intensely active rich mind, like Arnold's, has an inspiring stirring power among friends and fellow-speculators, though he may disconcert them by a too early demonstration; and there was a sufficiently strong nucleus of united liberalism in the Church to gather minds around it, if no opposite one of another sort appeared. The opposition to Arnold wanted a principle infusing into it, and a definite ground given it to stand on. It wanted a pledge for the future, as well as the demonstration of the present; a pledge that it would go on, and not allow the aggression to outlive it.

It so happened that there was a party at hand to give this pledge. The systematic movement on Arnold's part just happened to be coincident with a most decided and systematic one from an opposite quarter. The Church of England had, after a century of growing laxity, just come to the point at which she must either retrace her steps into a stricter state, or go forward into a formal latitudinarianism. Arnold was for the latter course; the writers of the "Tracts for the Times" for the former. The two schools met at these cross roads, as it were; and a remarkable contrast indeed they presented. The foremost characters in the Church movement, if they will excuse us looking at them so historically, were undoubtedly phenomena in their way, as Arnold was in his.

Of one of these we can speak: the death, that robs us of so much, gives at any rate this privilege. Singular it is that antagonist systems should so suit themselves with champions:

but if the world had been picked for the most fair, adequate, and expressive specimens of German religionism and Catholicism,—specimens that each side would have acknowledged,—it could not well have produced better ones for the purpose than Dr. Arnold and Mr. Froude. Arnold, gushing with the richness of domestic life, the darling of nature, and overflowing receptacle and enjoyer, with strong healthy gusto, of all her endearments and sweets; Arnold, the representative of high joyous Lutheranism, is describable:—Mr. Froude, hardly. His intercourse with earth and nature seemed to cut through them, like incongenial steel, rather than mix and mingle with them. Yet the polished blade smiled as it went through. The grace and spirit with which he adorned this outward world, and seemed, to an undiscerning eye, to love it, were but something analogous in him to the easy tone of men in high life, whose good-nature to inferiors is the result either of their disinterested benevolence, or sublime unconcern. In him the severe sweetness of the life divine not so much rejected as disarmed those potent glows and attractions of the life natural: a high good temper civilly evaded and disowned them. The monk by nature, the born aristocrat of the Christian sphere, passed them clean by with inimitable ease; marked his line and shot clear beyond them, into the serene ether, toward the far-off light, toward that needle's point on which ten thousand angels and all heaven move.

Of living persons we cannot speak, but the reader has his ideas of them pretty well fixed by this time; they form a regular group in our Church's history; and they brought with them a system and a philosophy of a somewhat deep, stern, and mystical aspect to confront to their antagonists'. The Catholic system, as it advanced from the worlds beyond the grave, came with some of the colour and circumstance of its origin. It contrasted strangely with the light, hearty, and glowing form of earth, that came from wood and mountain, sunshine and green fields, to meet them. And the unearthly, supernatural, dogmatic Church opposed a ghostly dignity to the Church of nature, and the religion of the heart.

The commotion of the Church-reform pamphlet but ushered Arnold into a more formidable and esoteric struggle with this new opponent—a struggle which had shifted from the ground of invasion, with him, to that of self-defence. He was not, indeed, selected as any special object of attack by the writers of the tracts, or any of the Oxford School; rather remarkably, the contrary. Jacob Abbot was commented on, and he was left untouched. But the appearance of such a system as theirs made it not a question of waiting to be attacked. The fact itself was enough. A system like his was bound to expel and thrust out such an anti-podist one, and, in order to have any chance of success for itself, could not allow the ground to be pre-occupied by an opponent.

It is remarkable, indeed, how completely a counter-aggressive movement to his own had turned the tables in this respect; and made the object of a negative success, a check to the rival, the chief and great point to gain, with him; instead of the positive spread of his own system. The stop thus given to the progress of "Church Reform" is felt; and,—“their object is to provoke the clergy to resist the Government Church Reforms,” is his complaint.

The matter, on Arnold's part, indeed, became from the first moment very serious. His first thing is to prophesy. He prophesies that the "Tracts," cannot take—that, though they may please a few of the clergy, the laity must scout them to a man. We may remark that Arnold is rather fond of prophesying, and prophesies with a kind of ocular certainty. However, the "Tracts" do take, and Arnold's argumentative pulse quickens. The religious naturalist saw in the new school a pernicious destructive species of theological animals, that were simply bent on eating into the core of liberalism: and a religious blight and plague seemed to be the inevitable result of the swarm spreading. The Oxford writers were "idolaters," "Judaizers," maintainers of the "priestcraft Antichrist," schismatics to the Church, and in principle traitors to the State.—“I call this Judaizing direct idolatry,” he says. “In other men I cannot trace exactly the origin of the idolatry,” but in them I do: “it is clear to me that Newman and his party are idolaters.” “With respect to the Newmanites, I do not call them bad men, nor would I deny their many good qualities; . . . I judge of them as I do commonly of mixed characters, where the noble and the base, the good and the bad, are strangely mixed up together. There is an ascending scale from the grossest personal selfishness, such as that of Cæsar or Napoleon, to party selfishness, such as that of Sylla, or fanatical selfishness, that is, the idolatry of an idea or a principle, such as that of Robespierre and Dominic, and some of the Covenanters. In all these, except perhaps the first, we feel a sympathy, more or less, because there is something of personal self-devotion and sincerity; but fanaticism is idolatry, and it has the moral evil idolatry in it.”—Their insisting on the necessity of the Apostolical Succession is “exactly like insisting on the necessity of circumcision.” And going upon his old favourite idea, of there being no descent either of blood or order in Christianity, and of this being a positive antichristian element to introduce into the system, a really rude violation of the Christian's holy freedom, he took “schismatic, profane,” and the like terms, clean out of the mouth of the Apostolical Church towards the latitudinarian, and applied them, if we may say so, with the utmost *naïveté* and simplicity towards the Church herself.

The Regale was urged heartily, and the Church movement

attacked from the Plantagenet platform. "In Elizabeth's time such a notion would have been reckoned treasonable." The notion of the Church being an independent body, and able to keep her own succession going on apart from the State, is "all essentially anarchical and schismatic;" and he is only defending, he says, "the common peace and order of the Church against a new outbreak of Puritanism to oppose it." It appears a curious objection, at first sight, from a man like Arnold, to urge against a particular religious claim, that it would have been considered treasonable in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. But this, as we have seen, is the period of English history to which he always goes for his ecclesiastical principles.

Another point of accusation, more of a moral one, does not come with peculiar grace from Arnold; viz. the charge of immodesty and impudence in persons daring to go so counter to received opinions in their views of things and persons. "I have read Froude's volume, he says, and I think that its predominant character is extraordinary impudence. I never saw a more remarkable instance of that quality than the way in which he, a young man, and a clergyman of the Church of England, reviles all those persons whom the accordant voice of that Church, without distinction of party, has agreed to honour, even perhaps with an excess of admiration."—Now, let it be ever so true that "the accordant voice of the Church of England" has taken one view of Cranmer and the Reformers, whereas Mr. Froude took another, Arnold was not precisely the person to found a charge of impudence upon such a fact. A man who, without a vestige of internal scruple or misgiving, unchristianized the whole development of the Church from the days of the Apostles; who made the very disciples friends and successors of the Apostles, teachers of corruption; who made the Priesthood an Antichrist, and had just himself shocked the whole Church of England by the promulgation of a religious theory repugnant to the feelings and ideas of almost all her members, to a man; was certainly not a person to be tender in requiring compliance with received views from another, or quick to call in another impudence what in himself was the necessary adjunct of philosophy.

The condemnation of Dr. Hampden, by the Oxford Convocation, in 1836, brought a powerful accession to these feelings. It was a vigorous demonstration in exactly the opposite direction to his own; and he felt it to be such. But on this subject we have a preliminary remark to address to Mr. Stanley: there is an assertion of his upon this subject, which we should like him to explain. An amiable feeling, which we should be the last to blame him for, appears to have suggested a method of softening this somewhat rough part of Arnold's career, and he vulgarizes the opposition to Dr. Hampden, in order to fit and

accommodate it for Arnold's aversion. He says;—"There is no reason for believing that the most eminent of Dr. Hampden's opponents had any sympathy with the conduct and feeling of the great mass of his supporters." Now all we can say is, that if "the most eminent of Dr. Hampden's opponents" had no sympathy with the general mass of opposition on that occasion, they were the most accomplished and the most audacious hypocrites that ever exhibited in public life. For they originated that opposition, they headed it throughout; they wrote, they spoke, earnestly and heartily, in public and in private, about it; they appeared at the very top of the movement; they collected, strengthened, and systematized the opposition, they sustained it, and they brought it to its consummation. If Mr. Stanley alludes to a more esoteric standard of sympathy than the recognised public one, we do not profess to be able to follow him. He may be right or wrong in asserting that the average inward religious *ἥθος* of a body of five hundred members of Convocation, was not one in which Mr. Keble, Dr. Pusey, and Mr. Newman, recognised the exact reflection of their own. But without deciding this question either way, it is as certain as facts can make it, that the feeling against a latitudinarian innovation on the Church-doctrines,—which was real and strong in that convocational movement against Dr. Hampden, however political motives, in such a large mass, mingled with it,—was a feeling in which "the most eminent of Dr. Hampden's opponents" heartily sympathized, and with which they *bona fide* allied themselves and acted.

To proceed:—Arnold's view of the question was soon settled, and very decidedly. "Hampden's Bampton Lectures" were to him "a great work, entirely true in their main points, and most useful."—"Hampden only did what real reformers had ever done, what the Protestants did with Catholicism, and the Apostles with Judaism." He instantly identified Hampden's system with the principle of religious march and improvement, and made it the natural development of the creed of the Reformation. "Hampden holds exactly the language and sentiments," he says, "which Cranmer and Ridley, I believe, would hold if they were alive now." The opposition to him, on the other hand, he identified with the line of Catholicism in the English Church from the first. The Oxford Convocation of 1836, "was a repetition of the scenes at the Reformation." The "Oxford High-church outcry" at Dr. Hampden, as Regius Professor, was an echo of the "Oxford Roman Catholic outcry" at Peter Martyr, as Regius Professor, in the reign of Edward VI. The censure of 1836, was "the condemnation of Burnet's Exposition of the Articles by the Lower House of Convocation," repeated a century later in another form. "The Non-jurors reviling Burnet, the Council of Constance condemning Huss, the Judaizers banded together

against St. Paul," were all concentrated in the opposition of the University of Oxford to Dr. Hampden. Arnold's feeling on the Church movement now assumed more of a solid, practical shape, more of a moral disgust, than it ever had. "Hampden's business," he says, "seemed to me different, as there was in that something more than theoretical opinions; there was downright evil acting, and the more I consider it, the more does my sense of its evil rise. Certainly my opinion of the principal actors in that affair has been altered by it towards them personally. I do not say that it should make me forget all their good qualities, but I consider it as a very serious blot in their moral character."

An article in the *Edinburgh Review*, to which the title of "the Oxford Malignants" was attached, and which (though that was not, it appears, of Arnold's, but the editor's putting) fully bore out its title; at last let out the full torrent of his indignation. "It is painful to dwell," says his biographer, "on a subject of which the immediate interest is passed away, and of which the mention must give pain to many concerned. But, though only a temporary production, it forms a feature in his life too marked to be passed over without notice. On the one hand it completely represents his own strong feeling at the time, and in impassioned earnestness, force of expression, and power of narrative, is perhaps equal to anything he ever wrote; on the other hand, it contains the most severe and vehement, because the most personal, language which he ever allowed himself deliberately to use."—A more hearty, sincere, enthusiastic vituperation of an adversary indeed could not well have been penned. Arnold did nothing by halves. The opponents of Dr. Hampden were denounced, amidst a variety of names, specially as being the modern representatives of the "party of Hophni and Phineas." And Arnold could afterwards defend the expression with all the gravity of a logician. "Hophni and Phineas are recorded as specimens of the worst class of ministers of an established religion. I do not say or think that — and — are bad men" (a rather tame mode, by the way, of expressing a favourable opinion of the persons whom these blanks appear to represent). "I do not think that John Gerson was a bad man, yet he was a principal party in the foul treachery and murder committed against John Huss at the Council of Constance."

He now sets to his task in a regular systematic way; "having written once agonistically," he resolves "to go deeper to work with the root of error, from which all this Judaizing springs." A series of Church of England tracts suggests itself to him.—"I want to get out a series of 'Church of England Tracts,' which, after establishing the supreme authority of Scripture and reason, against Tradition, Councils, and Fathers, and showing that reason is not rationalism, should then take two



lines, the one negative, the other positive; the negative one, showing that the pretended unity, which has always been the idol of Judaizers, is worthless, impracticable, and the pursuit of it has split Christ's Church into a thousand sects, and will keep it so split for ever: the other positive, showing that the true unity is most precious, practicable, and has in fact been never lost. . . . That all sects have had amongst them the marks of Christ's Catholic Church, in the graces of His Spirit, and the confession of His name; for which purpose it might be useful to give, side by side, the martyrdoms, missionary labours, &c., of Catholics and Arians, Romanists and Protestants, Churchmen and Dissenters. Here is a grand field, giving room for learning, for eloquence, for acuteness, for judgment, and for a true love of Christ, in those who took part in it,—and capable, I think, of doing much good. And the good is wanted; because it is plain that the Judaizers have infected even those who still profess to disclaim them. . . . I shall talk this matter over with Hawkins, who has behaved nobly in this matter, but who still, I think, contributed to their mischief by his unhappy sermon on Tradition."—"Notes and Dissertations on the Three Pastoral Epistles (Timothy and Titus), to embrace naturally every point on which the Oxford Judaizers have set up their Heresy, the Priesthood, Sacraments, Apostolical Succession, Tradition, and the Church," was another project.

As the antagonistic feeling however grows, the scheme of writing *at* the party from Rugby gradually gives way to the intense longing to be at head quarters at Oxford:—"I should be of weight from my classical knowledge, and I am old enough now to set down many of the men who are foremost in spreading their mischief, and to give some sanction of authority to those who think as I do, but who at present want a man to lean upon." We may observe, generally, that his spheres of usefulness tend to lap over each other in his imagination. He has had hankerings after India—had once a notion of going to Ireland to "Christianize the gentry"—has a great fancy for New Zealand, and for founding a colony. And so with literary fields—"a complete ecclesiastical history"—a Roman history—the Scriptural interpretation line—the Church and State science—captivate him one after another. A report of the promotion of Dr. Hampden to a Bishopric, opens out a prospect to him now.—"I wish they would put me in his place in Oxford. I could do more good at Oxford. I should have a large promising body of young men disposed to listen to me for old affection's sake." And "his bad name" to be defended is another object which requires the Oxford arena: he even mentally courts a Hampden-war against himself, to bring matters to a point about him. "He ought not silently to bear a sort of bad name, which, to man or dog, is little better than hanging." If there is a similar feeling

against him, that there is to Hampden, let it "be got up into some tangible shape."

Anyhow he wants to be where he can confront the actual leaders of the party. The times are roughening. He feels an actual call to battle, to see whether the tract-movement is or is not to be checked. To him especially it spoke aloud, "You must not let these minds go on—you must come to close quarters with them—you are the man to do it—you must stand in the defile." An intensity of conviction on his own side of the question, together with the gallantry and frankness of his nature, made up altogether a sort of high pugnacious enthusiasm. He wanted fairly "to be at 'em," to use the pugilistic phraseology; to try strength, muscle, and sinew with them; to feel himself in the encounter. His state of mind was in itself the loudest challenge. It said to all the world, come and be knocked down,—feel the force of intrinsic truth. "*Magna est vis veritatis et prævalebit.*" The challenge was natural in him. "If any respectable man of *my own age* chooses to attack my principles, I am perfectly ready to meet him, and he shall see, at any rate, whether I have studied the question or no." His imagination was now peopled with Judaizers. The word is always at his tongue's end. An ignorant reader would be really perplexed by the perpetual recurrence, and form an almost bearded image of the school Arnold was opposing. And "Have at the Judaizers," was the internal watchword; "Shiver the Judaizing idol in pieces." "My spirit of pugnaciousness would rejoice in fighting out the battle with the Judaizers as it were in a sawpit."

The striking feature of Arnold's mind,—and we notice it as being literally a phenomenon, a remarkable specimen of that particular internal power,—is his confidence; we mean a rare, esoteric intensity of assurance in his own views. He is *omnia magna*; has every quality that there is in him forcibly, and confidence among the rest. A firm faith is one thing; what we mean is another. A brilliancy of the whole chamber of the mind—a dance of light—a clearness which made his own view of truth to him an object of the keenest internal ocular demonstration, rather than of faith, carried him into conflicts and controversies with a boldness that an evident warrant from the invisible world might produce. A phantasmagoric halo of truth accompanied him, and the flame played upon his helmet, as it did on that of Diomedes; he was invulnerable; his armour was proof against sword-cut and thrust; a dip in the magical pool had achieved the same security for him that it had done for the hero of old. His courage was not tried and deepened by fear; it saw nothing to be afraid of; it went right forward without a misgiving to its object. The contest with other minds, and genuine argument, where truth is at stake and is to be lost or

won, has something of the fearful character; it is a trial of strength; one mind struggles with another, and the invisible push and blow are felt within: nervousness and misgivings, mistrust of self, and sense of weakness, are the natural sensations more or less of him who feels the conflict and knows what he has to look forward to. The highest human courage is compounded, in a great measure, of fear; it attains its triumph by its sensibility, and does not drive the instinct but decide the heart. The air that we breathe is composed, to a large extent, of atmospheric ingredients in themselves positively hostile to life; though, mixed with the crowning element, they support it. Take away the latter ingredients for the sake of an intenser support, and you have an air that volatilises life, and makes it evaporate in laughter and titillation. Air should not be all air: courage should not be all courage. Arnold longed to be in the thick of the conflict at Oxford, and imagined himself with vivid pleasure in the scene of danger and the struggle of mind; but he did not know what that really was which he was so ardent for; he did not appreciate the force of the minds he wished to encounter; he did not feel the evidences, whether they were great or small, on their side of truth. A torrent of internal, self-fed light—a dream of truth—carried him along, and displayed rather the animal courage of argument, than the sobered mixture of human zeal and fear becoming the process. His courage saw no difficulties, and marshalled no nervous symptoms of mental distresses, doubts, apprehensions, weaknesses, in the prospect; a gallop and good hearty exercise of the intellectual muscles, a pleasant circulation of the blood was pictured: he saw his own “gallows” and “leaping-pole,” in intellectual shape, in the scene; he saw the field of thought and energy, and the development of the whole man, before him. The prospect was full of delightful anticipation; and Bagley-wood, and Shotover, and Ifley, and Newnham, mingled their scenic tents and gaieties with the theological battle on the arena of Oxford. Fights on the Apostolical Succession, and walks to Bullingdon, youthful joyous associations, religious truth and the Cherwell, combined all in one captivating image. The view before him was a mixed and grotesque one, because every feature of it was so real; genuine religious polemics—genuine Bagley-wood. The genuineness and heartiness bind all together, and make a characteristic whole of it: the sombre arena, and the mortal fight, cannot resist the powerful transforming influence of the German mind; they go through the flowery metamorphosis, and breathe lightness, spirit, exuberance, and security.

The author of *Undine* has exquisitely symbolized, in the contrast of grave humanity and the soul with fairy nature, two great classes of character. He describes a light transparent world of life to begin with: a heart all air, quick sense, and

effervescing spirit. Brisk joyous beings sport aloft, or mingle with the stream, or colour the bank-side; grow, swim, fly, bound; are trees, fish, bird, or brook, or cloud, or sun-shine, or green earth: brooks walk, men flow, all mingle in one wild luxuriance; and earth and nature live and move, and weep and laugh, in their own efflorescences and emanations. Sweet tears, rough merriments, and transient wraths—all simple tendernesses and picturesque excitements, flow, explode from nature's infancy and boyhood. A solemn gift descends upon this airy mixture, and it subsides; a weight is felt, and nature, she knows not how or why, is changed from what she was. "Moonlight hath in her sober livery all things clad," and shows an altered landscape to the heavy, burdened eye. The royal crown of reason presses the wearer down. The bright heart turns contemplative, and looks within herself; mistrusts, misgives, foretels. A sobering visitant works within, and impregnates the light exuberance with a sad serenity. The sympathetic reader grieves at the change, and feels inclined to reproach the soul with cruelty, and hardheartedness. "Why spoil this fairy scene," he says, "and tame the life that sparkled with animation before you came and overspread it?" The change from vivid to serious in life's stages; the accession of depth to the soul, in all its degrees, is the source of conscious weakness, undoubtedly, as well as dignity; and self-mistrust and apprehension marks the grown man, as self-confidence does the boy.

We do not see the man absolute in Arnold. Manly in his own department, upon the broad basis and open field of life he is a splendid boy. His ignorance of the world around him, peculiar unreasonablenesses, surprises, complaints, indignation, the rush into the battle with the mixture of fun and fierceness, show the boy. Positive, eager, sanguine; his appetite of mental courage, and joyous strength of nature, lack the subduing becalming sovereignty of soul.

We are approaching the end of our observations. Arnold's sudden death, in the midst of his philosophical and religious career, makes it unfair to draw any result as to his natural intrinsic influence, his inherent effectiveness as a philosopher, from the matter of fact event. One who has not had his full time to work in, should not be judged as if he had had; or be expected to have created his world, and established his system. At the same time, we do not see any tendencies in Arnold's course in this direction, or signs of an evidence and spread which only wanted time. As a proselytizer, a spreader of certain views, we do not see him so much advancing as receding; and his religious career seems to grow more and more solitary.

That this was the main effect of causes external to himself is indeed true; and yet that he contributed himself to it, by a very positive deficiency in his character and mind, we can hardly

doubt. Arnold had but slightly that fundamental and all important quality for a spreader of opinions, and a winner and gainer of minds, that great faculty of manhood—the power of intellectual sympathy, and of entering into other people's minds. With singular opportunities in this direction amongst the opposite minds he was thrown with at college, and the high-church friendships of a life; whether from natural incapacity, or from want of taking proper pains, he never seems to have learned this art and power. His "skirmishes" with Mr. Cornish, Tucker, Coleridge, the Kebles at Oxford, were, as such contests naturally are in youth, pleasant exciting feats of intellectual skill: he delights in looking back upon them, as he would entertain any other pleasing reminiscences. But what is to be observed is, that neither the arguments, nor the minds themselves of his opposite-thinking friends, ever seem to have taken hold of him, and fairly gained an apprehension from his reason. The totally opposite views of men loved and known, are at any rate a strong fact. This fact does never appear to have got a really deep reception into Arnold's mind. He does not embrace it, enter into it, try to put himself in his opponent's point of view, and state of thought, and feel the force of the evidence on his side, whatever it may be. He applies his clearness and force to his own side of the question only. Lively and paradoxical in his conversation at college, speculative and self-confident in his letters afterwards, his argumentativeness throughout plays and expatiates within himself, and does not enter within the adversary's lines. His career is one of self-development; a philosophical growth from within entirely, and an expansion of a set of primary individual ideas. Highly communicative of principles, he does not imbibe them; and he impregnates inferiors without understanding equals.

The consequence is that distinction in him that we have already alluded to. At Rugby he is great, because at Rugby only the power of self-expansion and self-imparting was wanted. A school of boys is a great receptacle of ideas, and not a counter-stream; they lean upon the master mind, treasure up the thought, suck in the hint, but oppose no standard of their own to exercise and try the master's apprehension, and to be penetrated and surmounted by it. Arnold could watch with genuine tutorial sympathy every stage of the ingress of the idea from his own mind into the pupils; and all the issues from himself were keenly and minutely seen. That answered perfectly for Rugby; that showed the accomplished schoolmaster. But the schoolmaster came out into the world, and then the scene was changed. In order to implant his ideas in men and equals, he had first to understand theirs; and be the learner and the listener, that he might be the teacher: and that he could not be; or would not try to be. He came out into the world, and immediately spoke

*ex cathedra*, as if he were in his school-seat. He pictured the world a large Rugby, a grand receptacle of his ideas, and did not think of it in any other light. But the world turned out to be no passive receptacle; it started back and was restive; and then Arnold could not deal with it. Then Arnold was a child. He saw that he had disturbed people indefinitely, but he saw no more. He could not explain, meet objections, soften, accommodate. He could not see why people objected; the mind without was a blank to him; and he could only stare and complain of the unreasoning mass. He was out of his element. Triumphant at Rugby, his exhibition in the world was a failure. His Church-reform pamphlet was a leap into a sphere for which he was unfit; and it let out a secret, which the world might not have discovered else, viz. that he was not a great man. A great man manages a department like Rugby with one hand, and has another as good for another. A corner of his mind is in the professional sphere, while he has the rest for the open field of life. But Arnold did not manage Rugby with a corner of his mind, or anything like it. He had the whole of his practical power invested there. He had none to spare for the world at large. And when he came into the world, therefore, he was not at home there, and blundered. This accounts, by the way, for a few gentle pedantries that appear in the Rugby department. Able and successful as he is there, his ability is accompanied with rather more of a smack of the lips than sounds quite great—an indication ordinarily that the whole man is expending himself on his work, and is not adequate for a much larger simultaneous charge.

Upon the open world, accordingly, even the creations of Rugby begin to be independent of him, and slip out of his philosophical hands. When they cease to be passive receptacles, the main hold over them, we perceive, is gone; the mind that impregnated their intellectual infancy can not deal with their intellectual strength; and as they advance to be equals, they feel thoughts arising which the quondam master does not answer or pacify, nor indeed understand enough to cope with. The mass have "diverged more and more widely" from him. He has formed no school; he has produced no race of his religious opinions to perpetuate and multiply the parent stock. He has given a cast and a complexion, indeed, to the minds that were directly under his care; and he has scattered about historical tastes and classical theories; and he has left a delightful remembrance of himself in his pupils' hearts: but he has not made them think what he did; and the instincts which he put into them, the love of the real and genuine, do not go in his direction for the object of it. Arnold, in short, as his career advances, becomes more and more religiously alone in the world, and finds himself to be either a premature or an eccentric philo-



sopher. His favourite theories are almost confined to his own breast; his Church and State ideal lives in himself: he must send his petition to parliament alone.—“I want to take my stand on my favourite principle, that the world is made up of Christians and non-Christians; with all the former we should be one, with none of the latter. . . . I want to petition against the Jew Bill, but I believe I must petition alone; for you would not sign my preamble, nor would many others who will petition doubtless against the measure.” He fails in Christianizing the Useful Knowledge Society, and withdraws. The combination of rejecting and being rejected; of seeing faults in all schools which prevented him joining any, and being dissented from by all schools because his particular mixture was not theirs, has a melancholy effect on the reader as he advances through this book. He took, he told, he fascinated himself; but his system fell dead. He was admired, and what he said was admired; and the motive, and the spirit were praised; and the idea was thought his own shape of some truth; but the idea, as he thought it, was not taken. The highest admirer subtly evaded the task of the disciple: and the teacher sat alone in the porch, while the man was surrounded.

Aristotle draws a distinction between *sophia*, and *phronesis*; or, as we may translate them in one aspect, between the speculative power, and moral tact or experience. He says young men and young minds are capable of the one, and not of the other. Young minds can evolve their own ideas, and be philosophical; but they cannot have experience before they have acquired it. Whether we have caught Aristotle's meaning or not, some distinction, not unlike it, seems to apply to Arnold. He evolves his own mind, but he does not enlarge it by experience, that is to say, by contact with other minds. Speculation is necessarily upon ideas that we already have. It is not its office to renovate and enlarge; it does not pretend to freshen and pour new blood into a mind. Contact with other minds does this, *i.e.* when it is genuine and real; where the man feels his way about others, catches their meaning, gathers their point of view, exposes himself to the whole weight of another's mind upon his own; and receives, with the full embrace of a sensitive appreciation, arguments which he does not assent to, and a whole basis of thought which he cannot appreciate. It must not be a sham contact, a mock fight, a tussle for the sake of fun, a mere source of life and spirit to the communication of his own view, a mere stimulus to self-development. It must be the *bonâ fide* action of mind upon mind, where the blow is home felt, and your adversary's thrust received into your reason's heart. You either survive the sword's point of your antagonist, and gain a most quick, lively, subtle experience of another man's power and form of thought; you appropriate a new sympathy,

and take home another mind: or you die under a nobler antagonist, and so much the better still; for you rise to his level, you enter upon his state of mind, and suffer a painful but glorious metempsychosis. In either case there is enlargement, either that of sympathy, or that of transition. And both of these are more or less necessary to make up a real philosophical experience; such as fits a man for the conflicts of intellectual life, and enables him to understand and deal with other minds. It is astonishing, indeed, what an irresistible engine this power of sympathy and self-bending has shown itself to be in some great religious intellects of the Church. Ever flexible, malleable, fusible at its own will, overflowing with self-mastery; melting and embosoming, absorbed and absorbing; the imperial element of liquid mind has lapped round its millions like a flood. Up comes the subtle water everywhere, and bathes a world. Invisible nets, impalpable soothing tendrils, creep over human souls unconscious and delighted: and they are clasped and won. High alchemy and self-transmuting power of mind! Effectiveness of sympathy! of a nature ever ready to be what she is not, and throw off her own self for another. The mere faculty inherits the earth: she gains a thousand selves by losing one. Life becomes self-multiplying, and one mind is a million. An individual symbol of the empire of the Church Catholic over her children, her heavenly wiles, her awful sweetness, her iron endearments; the sympathy which earth cannot escape from though she would, and which makes her the confidant of all human hearts at once.

Arnold's career of self-development was attended by the natural accompaniment to himself of isolation. No keen trials had won him the field of experience and sympathy, freshness and enlargement; and the concomitant of such a basis of mind was, that it had no domain and empire. As a religionist, he stretched along his own line, and covered his own ground only: and we, on our side, are bound to think it fortunate that it was so. The truth is, we had much rather not think of him as a religionist at all; we had rather, much rather, think of him as the Master of Rugby only,—the reformer of education—the generous superior—the communicative teacher—the watchful guardian, friend, and trainer of boyish nature; we had rather think of the affectionate, ardent, domestic heart only. Would that Arnold had stuck to his natural department, and not left it for the open world,—for the public arena of Theology! But he has not done so: he has entailed a biography upon his pupil which enters into the thick of religious controversies, and exhibits him in all the open undisguised fulness of the latitudinarian and rationalistic character. It has been no pleasure to us to view him in the antagonistic aspect—to touch on the tender doctrinal point—to notice how very deep Arnold's mind had imbibed the sad theory

which undermines all truth. But the doctrinal point, the theory, was before us in all its obviousness; a published life is a fact which must be dealt with as it stands, and forces the inevitable duty on us of deciding and stating what a man is. We appreciate and understand fully the affection which Arnold has created for himself, and the love and gratitude of the Rugby pupil now refined and heightened by his death. Any pain caused to any one of a circle of whose society and high tone of feeling the writer of these pages has long had the privilege and benefit, is equalled by his own; but to have stated the plain truth as it appeared to him, though a pain, will never be a regret.

## NOTICES.

*Sermons by* SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, M.A., *Chaplain to his Royal Highness Prince Albert, and Archdeacon of Surrey.* London: Burns. Oxford: Parker. Gosport: Jacob. 1844.

It seems idle, at this time of day, to discuss the peculiar power and merits of the Archdeacon of Surrey as a preacher. Enough for us to express our thankfulness, as we did on a former occasion, that the mind to which the eyes of all Englishmen are turned with increasingly respectful interest, is so often presented with high and catholic truth in so very forcible and interesting a way. Archdeacon Wilberforce has much the same intensely finished, *burnished* style, as his relative, Archdeacon Manning—a similarity which we suppose neither gentleman will be averse to our pointing out. And this, in the case of our present author, may be even a necessary harmony with scenes and circumstances where life altogether receives its highest outward finish, the Church having an inherent capacity of presenting, and even call to present, a mirror to every form of humanity that is not contrary to the Law of God.

We have said that our author presents us with “high and catholic truth,”—not meaning thereby that Archdeacon Wilberforce inculcates what a certain class confines itself to in *Church principles*, but that he goes into depths, and presents us with the higher things, the “strong meat” of the Gospel. Of these we will give two illustrations. In handling the doctrine of the Trinity, our author leaves that mere bearing on the *oikonomia* with which alone the sectarian is contented, and by being contented with which he leaves himself undefended from any and every heresy, and passes on to the *θεολογία*, as that which redeemed and regenerate man is called to contemplate. This is strikingly put as follows:—

“It is Trinity Sunday; the seal and completion of all the great preceding feasts of the Christian year. Advent woke us first with the message of Christ’s coming; at Christmas we stood around His cradle; then we wept beneath His cross; at Easter we heard the gospel-message, that the Lord was risen; then, after tarrying forty days upon the earth, He ascended into glory. And all these works were parts of our redemption; even to the last; to the pouring out His gifts at Whitsuntide. But now they are completed. The incarnation of the Lord, His life, His death, His resurrection, His ascension, His sending of the Holy Ghost, all are completed: man’s

redemption is completed—that wonderful work of God is finished ; and what do we now ? We look onward still ; beyond all these ; beyond the incarnation, beyond redemption, beyond time, beyond creation ; we are as it were carried on into the distant depths of the coming eternity. And God is all, the Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and which is, and which is to come.”

So on Miracles, our author discards, as insufficient, the shallow evidential notion of Paley and Co., and presents us with this just and practical view of them :—

“ Such briefly is this miracle. And doubtless there is in it, what there is in all the miracles of Christ, a proof of His almighty power, and so of the truth of His mission. ‘ No man can do these miracles that Thou doest except God be with him.’ This is the first impression which should be made on us by such a narrative.

“ But this first impression is not enough ; besides this general truth, there is some special wisdom to be gathered from every work of our blessed Lord. For every act of His was a symbol to be read by the eye of faith, and to nourish within us some especial truth. Thus, He raised the dead to show Himself the Lord of life ; He wrought His works of mercy on the sick to shew Himself the Healer of our bodies ; He cast out devils that we might believe in Him as the Deliverer of our spirits ; and so here He multiplied the loaves that He might show Himself to be indeed the Lord of the secret essences of things. It is, as it were, the withdrawing of the mantle from that which, because it is so veiled, we call nature, and the showing us Himself ;—a person as opposed to a mere power ;—working all things in this world which we see around us as well as in the mightier spiritual world which we see not, and giving to all things, as He blesses them, and as they pass through His multiplying hands, their increase and their power of satisfying us. For this is that which He here did. He who had so long fed the hungry, now laid bare His working. He who had prepared the corn before it grew ; who had given it of old its capacity of increase ; whose wisdom had devised and whose power had provided for its growth ; who, out of its corruption in the earth, had year by year brought forth its increase ; who had given summer and winter, seed-time and harvest, the softening shower, the ripening sun, and the nourishing air ; who had made it strangely capable of drawing up into itself the moisture of the soil, and of gathering out of the impalpable air the solid matter which furnished its increase ; He who commonly had wrought thus unseen, now did but lay bare His working, connect Himself visibly with His wonders, and show us the multiplying hands to which all things owe their virtue and increase.”

The sermon on the Sons of God might, we think, be suitably worked up and published separately as a tract. Many, we need not say, will listen to Archdeacon S. Wilberforce, who will not listen either to us, or to people far better than us.

*Holiness the True Reforming Power of the Church. A Sermon, preached in St. Andrew's Chapel, before the Bishop and Clergy of the Diocese of Aberdeen, in synod assembled, on the 7th day of August, 1844. By the Rev. P. CHEYNE, Minister of St. John's, Aberdeen. Aberdeen: Brown and Co. Edinburgh: Grant and Son. London: Burns.*

A SERMON full of high thought and feeling; but most plain-spoken. Mr. Cheyne does not think it necessary to hide Church defects. He says: "So far, certainly, as confessions of imperfection and defect assume the language of bitterness or complaint, or spring from fretful and impatient repinings at the state in which Providence has placed us, they are wrong in the individual who makes them, and can serve no end but to perpetuate and aggravate the painful deficiencies of our system. But it is not the less true, that without humble confession going before, there can be no hope that God will ever remedy what is evil or restore what is lost, and to make that confession from a deep sense of our own sins, and the sins of our forefathers, can be no token of unfaithfulness in us, any more than the like confession was in holy Daniel; on the contrary, it is the mark and offspring of the truest love." In the following comparison, the remarks towards the end appear to be especially applicable to the position which the Scotch Church has contented herself with occupying in that country; and the whole passage is calculated to rouse her spiritual energies, and raise her aim:—

"Time was when the Scottish Church was a nursery of saints, a true witness for the unseen kingdom, and a faithful guide to its transcendent realities—when she not only sent the light of holiness and truth through her own wild and sterile regions, softening hearts more rugged than her mountains, but also made her light to shine abroad to those who sat in darkness. She is not now, nor can she have been at any time, more destitute of outward gifts—more unfriended of the world—more powerless in all that human judgment reckons power, than when she sent forth her sainted missionaries to convert the dark Northumbria, or gather a flock to Christ in the distant islands of the north. Sanctity was her only strength; she cherished the hidden life by self-renunciation and disengagement from the world, and that life expanded and wrought out on every side, till it had kindled the dormant mass with its own quickening virtue. When we contemplate our own comparative fruitlessness, we may ask, is it the same Church or the same system that is set to cope with the evils of the existing generation? or, if the Church be, as we believe, ever the same, must it not be another and a worse system—less holy, less energetic, less perfect, since it falls so much short of the achievements of what we, in our overweening pride, call a dark and barbarous age? If we have not to contend with a surrounding mass of heathenism, we are placed in the midst of false doctrine, heresy, and schism;



and what are the thoughts entertained about our duties towards that tremendous evil, or are we supposed to have any? Is it not rather openly maintained that our position is by no means an aggressive one; that we are to make no inroads upon this mass of corruption; that we are to treat it with all tenderness and respect, because it may have been taken under the fostering care of human governments? Hence the coldness, amounting to indifference, almost to hostility, with which many, over whom the Church has the claims of a mother and a queen, turn away from her when she calls upon them for their dutiful ministries, and try, as it were, to keep her down, lest she should rise up and take possession of her inheritance."—Pp. 14, 15.

---

*Das Allbuch, eine Bibel; das ist, die Offenbarung des Logos, empfangen und uberliefert durch CLEMENS von HAMBURG.*

(*The Book for All: a Bible; i.e. the Revelation of the Word, received and published by CLEMENS of HAMBURGH.*)

THIS work, the first part of which is now published, pretends to be a new revelation. The prophet, to whom it has been given, is some obscure person in Hamburg, who seems to think a little transient notoriety cheaply purchased, at the price of committing an audacious blasphemy. Five other books are promised, but whether or no the necessary revelations have been already received, or whether he is only expecting them, the author does not give his readers to understand. The work, when complete, will contain:—

1. The Book of Announcement, (that now published.)
2. The Book of Creation.
3. The Book of the Stars.
4. The Book of Powers, (chiefly chemical.)
5. The Book of the Living.
6. The Book of Humanity.

The Saviour warned men that many should come in his name; and should say, "Lo, here is Christ, and lo, there." As far as we can understand the prophet's preface, he seems to entertain a sort of idea that he has discovered the true secret whereby human nature is to be recovered from its fall, and to regain its original nobility; and being apparently possessed with the truth of his convictions, he is determined that the world should reap the benefit of them, in the form of a book, which he impiously calls a Bible, and which he still more impiously dares to dedicate to God. And further to recommend his work, he declares that it is addressed "to those only who know the value of, and seek to regain their original birth-right of freedom;" adding, further,

that "all persons who love bondage more than freedom, have nothing at all to do with this his announcement."

It will not be without its meaning, that a Protestant town should give birth to such a reckless, though, from what we have seen of his work, we should also say impotent deceiver. If this be the type of a Protestant Clement, we wish the Protestants of Germany all the joy they can possibly experience at the appearance of such a luminary. To ourselves, the apparition of such a person does nothing more than painfully recall our Lord's warning, that many such deceivers should come; and as for his presumptuous claim to a hearing from those who seek for the true freedom of soul and spirit, this is as old a trick as can be with such impostors; and only makes a sensible man remember St. Peter's words, "They promise them liberty, while they themselves are the servants of corruption; for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage."

---

*Die Anglicanischen Kirchen Zustände, mit besonderer berücksichtigung der Katolischen Bewegung in derselben, und des Puseyismus.*

*The Condition of the English Church, particularly with Reference to the Catholic Movement in it, and to Puseyism. By FRANCIS ELLER. Schaffhausen. 1844.*

DR. FRANCIS ELLER's pamphlet differs very little from that of Hermann Uhden's. It is the result of a visit of a German Protestant Herodotus to the priests and people of England. He regards his subject very much as a piece of curiosity, fit for travellers to examine and study, and accordingly opens by treating his countrymen to a preliminary historical sketch of the first beginning of the Church in England, as founded by St. Augustine, the missionary of St. Gregory; Chapter I. is an account of the Reformation in the time of Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth. Chapter II. The condition of the Church in the times of Cromwell. Chapter III. from the accession of William and Mary up to the beginning of the nineteenth century. Chapter IV. the Reform Bill, and other constitutional changes. These sketches do not show any deeply extensive acquaintance with historical documents; they are, however, amply sufficient for their purpose, to convey to German readers an idea of the times through which the English branch of the Church has passed since the days of Henry the Eighth.

The Second Part follows the same track with Von Uhden, and contains a quantity of statistic information as to the liturgy, government patronage, ecclesiastical customs, theological litera-

ture of what is called the Establishment, which would no doubt be found very tiresome to read through, and must have required great pains to collect together.

The Third Part reviews the present position and prospects of the Church. Chapter I. contains a notice which is instructive, as coming from a foreigner, of the various elements of religious discord to be found in the nation, and describes the character of different dissenting bodies.

The second chapter treats of the Catholic movement in the English Church, and contains a sketch derived from documents and pamphlets already made public, of the growth of what the author, in common with many English people, calls Puseyism. There would be something strange and instructive, that at last we should be taught what Puseyism really was by a German who had come over from his own land to study the nature of so remarkable a phenomenon; but, alas, for disappointed hopes, there follows no definition of Puseyism! It seems to be one of those singular phenomena which laugh at all attempts at being fettered down to a plain description; and which is still so much in every one's way, that it is impossible to decide whether it is from its being found to be impracticable or superfluous, that the description of this wonderful thing has not been attempted in the midst of all that is said and written respecting it.

Dr. Eller says very truly, in speaking of the excitement that prevailed in the University touching the election for the Professorship of Poetry—

“That many of the opponents of Mr. Williams had not so much as read his tract, and would have been unable to say even what its title was. Throughout the whole contest between the new school and its opposers, nothing could have been more shameful on the part of the latter, notwithstanding that they gained their point; or more honourable to the former, than the system of slander and vilification which the opponents of the new school made use of. What, for instance, was the offence of Mr. Williams? He had maintained that the truths of the Gospel must be preached with reasonable circumspection;—that all doctrines were not meant for all times and all men indiscriminately;—that the example of our Lord, of his Apostles, and of the Ancient Church, and the similarity between the ordinary and extraordinary dealings of God, all tended to the preparing men's hearts and spirits, in a wise and gradual manner, for the reception of the doctrines and discipline of the Gospel. However, the weight of the storm which fell upon this doctrine, which, to say the least, is not open to objection, was not on account of the doctrine, but because the high mysterious privileges of the Church had been claimed back again, and the pseudo-evangelical system, which had gained a preponderance in England, was subjected to a quiet, but cutting censure.”

Chapter III. contains an interesting account of the increased activity manifested in England for the cause of religion, the

details of which are quite unnecessary to most well-informed inhabitants of England, but which will be certainly welcomed by all pious German readers. On the whole, the work has its merits; it shows fairness, impartiality, and considerable care and labour in the execution.

---

*A Sermon on the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Church; preached in Winchester Cathedral, on Monday, July 8, 1844. By the Rev. WILLIAM BRUDENELL BARTER, Rector of Highclere and Burghclere. Printed at the request of some Clergymen in Winchester and its immediate neighbourhood. Winchester: Jacob and Johnson. London: Rivingtons; Hatchard and Son.*

THE following extracts show Mr. Barter's style of thought. We are sorry we can only give a few samples of it. Mr. Barter is contrasting the two systems of education—on Church principles, and on the liberal utilitarian ones so fashionable of late years:—

“The world is wearier than we may think of that excitement which constitutes the fleeting strength of human systems; and men, who, with heated minds and with feverish hands, have been seeking and grasping shadows, will turn when we expect not, and embrace with joy the blessed realities of true wisdom, if they are faithfully and affectionately offered to them.

“Our Church, too, has arisen from the slumber into which she had fallen, and, though shorn of the irresistible strength she might have put forth in the cause of her God had she never yielded to the world's excitements, she still gives proofs of those latent energies which may, under God's grace, achieve the mighty work of pulling down the strong holds of ignorance and error.”—Pp. 10, 11.

Again:—

“This radical difference in the views of education appears to me to arise from very opposite opinions with regard to the poor and the state of poverty. The man of this world, that is, the man whose philanthropy is confined to it, and takes no wider range, considers himself as placed on an eminence, from which he may look down with pity on the poor. Poverty is, in his view, a state of dishonour to the individual and a burthen to the State. On the other hand, the Christian economist regards the poor man as his brother; below him in this world's goods, but in all other respects his equal—and poverty itself he considers as a state of holy discipline, a preparation for the kingdom of heaven. Yea more; he looks on the poor as a class of society, who possess and exert a holy influence on the fortunes of states and of individuals. He knows that without their blessing he cannot

expect that the favour and protection of God will be granted to himself and to his country.

"It is not difficult to perceive how differently education, which is based on these conflicting principles, will act on the poor themselves. One system of instruction will make the poor man uneasy in his condition, and cause him to consider his poverty as his curse: he will be taught to look on those above him as on men who are possessed of the only real means of happiness; and his life will be one either vain or successful struggle to obtain for himself the same means of enjoyment. The Christian teaching will inculcate a different lesson; it will shew the poor that the rich have nothing to be proud of; that they have nothing to envy; that the differences of stations are ordinances of God, and therefore sacred, and just, and wise; and that in the sight of God, and in the hopes of eternity, we are all brethren—all equals."—Pp. 7, 8.

The distinctive character which the Church education of the poor receives from the Church's original view of the state of poverty, as well as the corresponding effects which such a view produces upon the poor themselves, are well and usefully put here.

---

"*Lachrymæ Ecclesiæ*," (Cleaver,) by Mr. Geo. Wyatt, Rector of Burghwallis, is a narrative partly continuous, and partly in the way of catalogue, drawn together chiefly from Walker's well-known "*Sufferings of the Clergy*." Such materials cannot fail of making an interesting book, which the present certainly is, and we have special reasons for recommending it: the way in which the clergy were strengthened to endure the horrors of the Rebellion, trained, as most of them were, in the worst of schools, always makes us hopeful that, when it pleases God once more to pass us through the furnace, some, at least, may prove not unequal to the fiery trial. The writer moves somewhat uncomfortably in the way of style, a heaviness which we attribute partly to his desire to bring out, as often as he can get the words in, a complex character for our Church, "Catholic, Reformed, and Protestant," (p. vii.,) which, contrary to the experience of some, he finds consistent: the consequence is, that when he has uttered one epithet, no matter which, for fear of consequences he is forced to award equal justice to the other two. We never could be persuaded that the rhubarb and lump of sugar were both equally good: but the triumph of malignity was when the nurse-maid gave the sugar first. Mr. Wyatt rather falls into this, for his favourite compound, (so favourite, that it is his running title,) is the "Anglican Reformed Church," which looks pleonastic, somehow. The most decorated specimen of this style is the "agglomerative" (to use Coleridge's phrase) title of a transatlantic communion, "the Reformed Catholic Protestant Episcopal Church:" like most second thoughts and limitations,

the agnomina seem to drag. It is of no use pairing horses if they won't step well together. However, the book is a very readable one of its school; and as schools are best understood by referring the genera to individuals, we should say that the Church Intelligencer best represents our author: thus, at p. viii., we find him classing together "Arians, Antinomians, Brownists, Baptists, Papists," a method of speech to which we suppose that there are some who attach, or fancy that they attach, a meaning. We are glad to hope, nevertheless, that Mr. Wyatt seems rather above than below this school, which, we dare to say, is a taking one; and, in a literary way, whatever renders the most ill-arranged and ill-indexed book in the language (which Walker's is) more readable, is a boon: Mr. Wyatt might, however, have given the references. We add a single sentence, not because it is novel, but because it will serve as a specimen of what we mean: "Such is the crooked, grovelling inconsistency of those who hold themselves above the guidance of the wise, sound, pure, *via-medial* light of the Anglican Reformed Church; preferring rather to cling to either the extremes of Popery on the one hand, with her idolatries and innovations, or to the extremes of Puritanism on the other, with her spurious pietism and her undisciplined vagaries," (p. 136.) When we are on good terms with ourselves, the glibness with which we scatter epithets, we suppose, relieves the pineal gland, in some over-loaded part whose specific function in the mental economy is to secrete adjectives: a little confusion is, now and then, the unavoidable result, as when we speak in the above passage of a "wise light," "a sound light," "a middle-course light." By the way, we recommend this queer adjective, "*via-medial*," to the candle-makers who advertise "mid-sized magnum dips."

We owe Mr. Brewer, of King's College, London, an apology for not having already noticed his valuable edition of Thorndike's great work, "*The Right of the Church*," which has been re-published by Cleaver. Although it will appear in the collected edition of the Anglo-Catholic library, the present volume, from its accessible size, is not by any means superfluous. It were impertinent either to pass an eulogy upon such a writer as Thorndike, or to call attention to Mr. Brewer's qualifications as editor, who has added an appendix, judicious, because brief, and, what was much wanted, a luminous index.

"*The Oblation and Invocation in the Scottish Communion Office Vindicated*," (Lendrum,) is a very sufficient reply, by Mr. Christie, to Mr. Craig's pamphlet, which has already been condemned and refuted in our pages. The series on this important subject will not be complete without Mr. Christie's excellent pamphlet. We trust that we may consider this controversy at an end: it commenced under miserable auspices, and its only practical result with which we happen to be acquainted is the cheering fact, that the Scotch office is regularly used in the beautiful church lately erected at Jedburgh by Lady Lothian. We are compelled to own, to adopt Mr. Craig's line, that there are "important" differences between the English and Scottish liturgies, and that in particulars the least satisfactory to ourselves. We are glad to find that a splendid edition of this office, with musical notations, has been published in 4to, (Burns); a companion, of course, to Mr. Dyce's edition of the "*English Service*."



The S. P. G. have adopted the practice of publishing a series of Tracts on their missions, which promise to be as useful as they are affecting. We ask particular attention to "New Zealand, Part I;" a complete collection of the Bishop's letters, and much of his journal. Without committing ourselves to the Society system, still less desiring to pass unqualified praise upon the details in the management of any of these bodies, we feel that, *for the most part*, the Propagation Society is doing the Church's work, as well as present circumstances will admit: and who can think of the Missionaries without looking, to say the least of it, at the good as well as the evil? We are afraid of sentimentalism, as much against, as in favour of, Societies.

"Yearsley's Contributions to Aural Surgery," No. 5, (Churchill,) is a work which we cannot quite make out why we were favoured with. We are bound, however, in literary etiquette, to acknowledge it; and as we cannot pass a professional judgment upon its merits, we will give a catalogue of varieties of "tinnitus," which, in mercy to our readers, we trust will affect their ears less powerfully than it did our own: we have hardly yet escaped the stunning effect of the following, which, as a specimen of descriptive and almost poetical onomatopœia, is matchless:—"Singing; ringing, as of bells, as after a box on the ear; humming, as of a sea-shell at the ear, as of a bee at the ear; rushing, as of a waterfall, as of wind; hissing, as of a kettle boiling; buzzing; beating, as of machinery, as of bedding; ticking, as of a pendulum; roaring, as of the sea, cataract, wind; puffing and blowing, as of a railway-engine; whizzing, as of a squib, as of ginger-beer; bubbling of water; sawing; grating; drumming; frying; rumbling; firing of a gun; rattling, as of carriages over stones; rustling, as of silks; whistling, as of wind through crevices; chirping of grasshoppers."—P. 12.

We spare the subsequent horrid enumeration of "rooks cawing, sparrows chirping, china smashing, furnace blasts, bell-ringing, drum-beating, cracked brass kettles," &c. &c. p. 13. Mr. Yearsley's object in this is sly: it permanently affects the tympanum only to read it: and Milton's opening of hell-gates, and Dante's crashing and screaming lines, are the whispering of an *Æolian* lyre, after what we have transcribed. The object of the book is, however, curious—to point out the pathological connexion of the throat and the ears: affections in the former, seem to be the cause of disease in the latter organ. Mr. Yearsley has only one case of permanent deafness after the battle of Waterloo upon record. Query, how many has Exeter Hall to answer for?

We do not much sympathise with "The Spirit of Dissent towards the Church of England, proved in a letter from a Clergyman to his Parishioners," (Leyland, Halifax,)—not that the details are not true, and not that the author is not very clever and amusing; but his style is not what we should feel to be quite gentlemanly. There may be a practical value in collecting the blackguardism of the lowest dissenters uttered against the Church; but some of the atrocities which we find in this pamphlet are so frightfully wicked and blasphemous, that they should never, we think, have been perpetuated in any form. We can, however, make much allowance for the irritation which being subject to such abuse has a tendency to produce: but let us all along remember "Michael the Archangel," &c.

Bishop Doane's "Twelfth Conventional Address," (Burlington,) has reached us. It has all the vigour and warmth of that distinguished prelate; and were it not that we are reluctant to imply censure in other quarters, we feel that its business-like details contrast favourably with the reports which we occasionally receive of "Charges" nearer home. Surely the work of the Church is better done by such practical appeals to churchmen to be up and doing, and to contribute of their substance, than by hinting at the "love of distinction" as the chief motive of the events of the last decade of years. We are glad to find that the "systematic offerings" in New Jersey succeed so well; though not always a conclusive, results form a gratifying, test of principles. Bishop Doane's pastoral on this subject is very properly appended.

A series of "Illustrations to Sintram and his Companions," drawn on wood, by Selous, and cut in wood, by Gray, (Burns,) we have elsewhere spoken of as proving the necessity of the artist drawing at once on the block; and so much has appeared on the life and works of Fouqué in our pages, that few will require to be reminded how highly we estimate the glorious tale of Sintram. The two best, to our mind, are Sintram and the Little Master, the scene at the sea-shore, and Sintram and Folko, when Satan tempts him with the spear: the least to our liking, is Gabrielle rescuing Sintram, neither the Lord nor the Lady of Montfaucon realizing our, or, we suspect, any ideal: and, throughout the series, the floating robes are, perhaps, too heavy and palpable. But we cannot speak too highly of the general beauty and power of the series. Mr. Selous is favourably known, not only by his cartoon, but by his Art-Union Series on the "Pilgrim's Progress:" we rate this set higher, as well because we prefer wood to etching, as because the imitation of Reztch is too palpable in the Bunyan prints. What we especially admire in these illustrations, is the graceful way in which the arabesque bordering melts into, and, as it were, acts as a mystical and spiritual shadowing of, the scene. We have heard it, or seen it, said, that the framing should have been more distinct: but such an observation shows little acquaintance with Fouqué, the characteristic of whose mind is a certain golden haze, a gorgeous glowing twilight, in which fact and allegory, the spiritual world and the seen, absorb each other: and recollecting this, we fancy that Mr. Selous has sought, in his wild suggestive monsters and angels, encircling the details of the tale, to embody what may be fixed upon as the one leading idea of Sintram, that half-defined vision, or sense of unearthly agencies for evil and for good, which battle for the child of heaven in this woeful world. We are not quite sure whether Mr. Selous is, or is not right, in giving an ideal of the Little Master different from the original, in Albert Durer, whose famous and mysterious print is copied in this series, but not very successfully; it approaches to the finical. Perhaps, also, Mr. Selous' last illustration is washy in effect, and inferior in design: inanity is not sweetness. These, however, are trifling drawbacks in a series in other respects very noble and delightful.

"Ambrose Ward, or the Dissenter reclaimed," a tale for the times, (Cleaver,) is a sort of Tract for the Times, done into a novel. We have so often ventured an opinion upon the religious fiction, a class of works we are glad to think passing away, that we care not to repeat it; more espe-

cially as the present little book is more than an average specimen of its sort. We should recommend it unconditionally, were we reconciled to this vehicle of truth; but we own that, in reading similar works, we systematically avoid the moral, and stick to the story,—a use of them which their several authors would be the first to deprecate. We do not quite see that it is consistent to make Mr. Forester first such a brute in the matter of his daughter, and, subsequently, so thoroughly amiable and agreeable.

A remarkable pamphlet appeared at Lausanne last year, "*L'Ecole Théologique d'Oxford*," par Armand de Mestral, Ministre de l'Eglise du Canton de Vaud, (Ducloux,) which, we trust, will have some circulation in England. It was called for by Mde. d'Aubigné's notorious squib "Geneva, and Oxford;" and Mons. de Mestral seems to think, (p. 162,) that "il ne faut pas croire avoir tout fait quand on a flétri le papisme sous le nom d'*Eglise de l'Antichrist* et de *Babylone*." He finds, in the Oxford School, "des matériaux utiles, des secours pour l'étude, souvent des traits de lumière," on this controversy. He is quite satisfied that, be the writings in question what they may, they fairly represent the accredited principles of the Anglican Church; and when his antagonist admits that he can only account for the existence of the hierarchical system from the third to the fifteenth century—and with this system he identifies our present English movement—upon the hypothesis of Satanic influence, *la force de Satan*, a phrase for which the Bishop of Chester, it seems, is indebted to D'Aubigné,—M. de Mestral tells the latter writer, that good logic ought to lead him to adopt Quakerism, and the sectarianism of the Baptists and Plymouth brethren. The present pamphlet scouts the psilo-Bible principle with remarkable fervour. Remembering that M. de Mestral is a Swiss Protestant minister, and that his book strongly resembles the Bishop of St. David's charge, we are curious to know how it has been received on the continent, and whether he represents any considerable section in his own religious community. We recommend the pamphlet very highly: it is by far the most important and uncommon that we have met with. We scarcely know whether the prevailing Protestant notion of the Church has ever been more happily and forcibly characterized, than in the following caustic sentence;—"Plusieurs considèrent l'Eglise non point comme un *corps* dans lequel nous sommes placés par un fait providentiel, par un premier acte de la grâce de Dieu (le baptême), mais au fond tout simplement comme un *club religieux* dans lequel on entre par choix et dont on peut se retirer quand on veut," etc. etc. All which he truly attributes to ignorance on the true idea of the sacraments.

"Sunday Afternoons at Home," by the author of the "Listener." (Seeley.) The "Listener" has quite won our hearts by this little book—one of the class of "sweet" books. And a sweet dear little book it is; a perfect love. We will give a sample:—

"I once made a visit to an aged saint, up three pair of stairs, in the neighbourhood of Rathbone-place. She was sick and past work, and living upon an allowance from the Aged Pilgrim's Society, and other doles of charity, I found her at dinner on a mess of turnip-greens. There was no snow-white damask on the table, but it was well scoured; the greens had not had time to cool, between the fire and the clean white plate, to which, without rising, she neatly and carefully transferred them, assuring me she

understood cooking very well. She told me turnip-tops were very dear in London; they used to be cheap in the country where she lived when she was young; and she had been very fond of them: so having money that day, she thought she would treat herself for once to a good dinner. 'And very fine they are,' she added, with a look of exultation as she proceeded with her feast—'Nobody need have a better dinner—they only want a little pepper; but then,' she added, with a complacent smile, 'we cannot have every thing.'—'We cannot have every thing,' I repeated to myself, as I returned to an abundant home. Where is there another dinner eaten this day in London with a relish so true—a taste so gratified—a heart so contented and sufficed. Amid the discontentments and complainings of a luxurious world, which nothing can silence, and nothing put to shame, *how often have I thought since of the turnip-tops and pepper, the saintly pilgrim's 'Every thing.'*"—Pp. 258—260.

"Rebecca Nathan, or a Daughter of Israel." (Rivingtons.) The author of "Rebecca Nathan" expresses a great anxiety "that whenever this volume falls into the hands of any of the daughters of Israel, *they will at least take the trouble to peruse it*, as the author's chief object in writing was a desire to be useful to them." Also, she particularly wishes "the *possessors* of this volume to co-operate with the author, and induce some son or daughter of Israel to read it whenever an opportunity may offer." The conscientious wishes of this lady partake of the sanguine character.

"Parochial Statistics, a Charge delivered in April, 1844, by C. J. Hoare, A.M. Archdeacon of Winchester." A useful Charge, in point of information, and going much into detail on the subject of parochial schools. Is Archdeacon Hoare ironical or not in the latter part of this passage? "Something of our own is allowed us still for endowments and parsonages from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Nor would we without gratitude to God recount the hard wrung bounty of a nation, which allows ten shillings a child towards building school-rooms, on certain conditions; *together with the great advantage of very able school inspection.*" And is he not rather too strict in his curtailment of clergymen's pecuniary contributions to their parish-schools? "I venture to suggest a very easy criterion for what ought to be the *proportion* of the clergyman's contribution to the common charitable fund, namely, *the proportionate amount of his assessment to the parochial rates.*"

"Sacramental Instruction, by the Rev. C. Bridges." (Seeley.) Mr. Bridges is as acute in seeing distinctions, as he is bold in expressing them. "*The Church to which we have subscribed is not that either of the Fathers or of the Laudian era, but of the Reformation.*" We accept his distinction, but should be sorry to admit his fact. The Reformation was certainly neither a Patristic nor a Laudian movement. That is to say, it is opposed to the spirit of the Church before it, and the Church after; which is saying a good deal. If Mr. Bridges is so kind as to hark us back to a prior era in our Church to the Laudian, we can return the compliment with interest, and in a direction which Mr. Bridges will not like.

"The Romans shall come and take away both our Place and Nation:" Treated historically in connexion with the prophecy of the man of sin, by

Edward M. Hearn, M.A. Trin. Coll. Dublin. (Seeley.) Mr. Hearn proves historically that the hatred of Rome is innate in the British mind. He commences early. Honour to those stanch protestants, Caractacus and Queen Boadicea, is his view. He seems to regard them as the instinctive witnesses of their day against Rome and Popery. The speech of the former before the Roman tribunal, "*Since universal empire is your object,*" &c. &c. receives quite the Exeter-hall savour from his pen. We cannot follow Mr. Hearn at present through his various historical researches, which are of a very recondite class: but we must remind him of a distinguished hero of that epoch, whom he has not embraced in his system;—the religious opinions of Jack the Giant-killer are still a mystery! If Mr. Hearn would fairly grapple with this question, he would find full scope for his peculiar talents, and great light would in the end be thrown upon the subject.

"The Wakefield Tracts." (Burns, London: Stanfield and Palmer, Wakefield). A series of cheap Tracts, written by "Clergymen in the manufacturing districts," for the purpose of spreading a knowledge of our Church doctrines among the poor. This is done in the story and conversational form. They enter a good deal into the Church service, and explain it. They explain the different parts of a church, their symbolical meaning and beauty, and put the building before people's minds in the true catholic aspect. They seem likely to be useful; and we are very glad to see such an attempt made in the quarter of the poor, a field which our recent high-Church publications have not sufficiently entered into.

"Pagano-Papismus." By Joshua Stopford, B.D., Rector of All Saints, in the city of York, 1765. (Hatchard and Son). We presume Mr. Joshua Stopford, who was rector of All Saints in York in 1765, is not a *living* author. But there is nothing either in the title-page or any other part of the book, which refers us to any medium between Mr. Stopford and ourselves, to account for the publication. Mr. Stopford must be supposed to have sent his MSS. to Mr. Hatchard himself during the last year, for anything we are told to the contrary. The book itself is trash. It seems to be published, however, for the sake of the epistle dedicatory prefixed, which is addressed "to the Right Honourable Richard Medcalfe, Lord Mayor, the Worshipful the Aldermen, and the Sheriffs and Commons of the ancient and faithful city of York;" and the exhortation in it runs thus (the author is alluding to certain "malapert professors of Romanism"): "*I am not for your sheathing the sword of justice in their bowels—yet let them know you have one, and that you can draw it.*" The nicety of the modification here is to be noted. Does the present editor, whoever he may be, intend nothing here with respect to modern parties? Or are mayors, aldermen, and sheriffs, expected to take the hint and wield the Protestant sword against us? We were not prepared for such a gladiatorial display. The prospect is truly formidable.

"Essays." By Alexander J. Beresford Hope, M.A., M.P. (Rivington.) Truth is either grave, vehement, or ingenious, in her own defence, as she likes. She appears in the latter character in Mr. Hope's volume; and is perhaps rather sanguine at times. The admirers of the traditionary will find a paper much to their taste in the essay on Brute of Troy. Mr. Hope has a clever view, and a high and refined tone, on every subject he takes to.

"Wild Love, and other Tales," from the German of De la Motte Fouqué, (Burns.) We need only mention a new story from Fouqué, to raise interest. The translator evidently aims at the closest and clearest reflection of the genius of the original. We hope to notice it in a future number.

"Vigilantius and his Times," by W. S. Gilly, D.D. (Seeley.) "*Noster Vigilantius*," is Dr. Gilly's motto. Let Dr. Gilly say so by all means; and no "*utinam noster esses*" will he hear from us. He "believes that the calumniated presbyter, Vigilantius, was one of those witnesses, who have been raised up from time to time, by divine grace, to bear testimony to the truth, and to be the links of its continuity through ages of rebuke and darkness." The author, however, in establishing this saintly and prophetic position for his hero, "confesses he has had to struggle with difficulties—the materials for the life of that Reformer *having come down to us principally in the works of his opponents*." When this is the case, there is certainly, as Dr. Gilly observes, "a difficulty" thrown in the way of the warm eulogistic biographer of modern times. And the skill which can extract the saintly character out of St. Jerome's language about a man, of whom St. Jerome takes the opposite view, is indeed admirable and perfect.

"Chapters on the Working People," by Benjamin Love, (Simpkin and Marshall.) Very clearly written, and with great good sense.

"Jocelyn." An Episode. Translated from Alphonse de Lamartine, by Robert Anstruther. (Bowdery and Kerby.) Lamartine is more successful in dealing with nature than with mind. His glowing and tender style upon the former subject matter becomes sentimentality and mawkishness upon the latter. The picture of the nightingale in her nest (p. 112), just occurs to us as a good specimen of his style of natural description.

The second of the series of "Catholic Devotional Works," (Burns,) has appeared, with a Preface by Dr. Pusey. It is Surin's Foundation of the Spiritual Life. It is only necessary to mention Dr. Pusey's two sermons preached at Ilfracombe, and dedicated to the Bishop of Exeter.

"Abbey Church," "The Birth-day," "Amy Herbert," "Little Alice," and several works of a similar character, stand over for a paper in our next Number, embracing the general subject.

As we are going to press we have received the S. P. G. Report; chiefly remarkable for a more than usually interesting and able preface.

Lady Chatterton's "Pyrenees, with Excursions into Spain" (Saunders and Ottley,) is nicely, but not very remarkably, written. The second volume bears interesting testimony to the restoration of churches in the South of France; churches which in many respects seem curious. We find that the possessions formerly held by the English in these parts have left traces somewhat analogous to our permanent modifications of the character and habits of Normandy.

That useful publisher, Van Voorst, proceeds very satisfactorily, and we trust successfully, with his two serials, "Illustrations of Baptismal Fonts," and "Instrumenta Ecclesiastica." We cannot speak too highly of the latter work, either in plan or execution. When finished, it will do more for the



work of making our country churches decent and catholic in externals than we can anticipate. We are glad to find the former collection in its complete shape.

To "Letters from Canada and the United States, by Mr. Godley," (Murray,) we propose to devote a more extended notice: we had done so in the present number; but to Canada we have already given much space, and Mr. Godley's notices of the States will come under review when we resume our papers on the Anglo-American Church. In the mean time, we recommend the volumes unconditionally.

"Gutzlaff's China Opened," (Smith and Elder,) will find at the present juncture what otherwise it would never have gained—readers. It contains a vast mass of information, most clumsily arranged, and repulsively told. The writer, a sectarian missionary, after speaking of the existence in Peking of "a Greek Church and a Roman Catholic Church," quietly adds: "one Church, however, is wanting—a temple dedicated to 'the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he has sent.'"—Vol. i. p. 65. In his view, the whole Church of the East, and the largest portion of the West, worship false gods!

A Fourth Part of the Motett Society's "Collection of Ancient Ecclesiastical Music" has just appeared. The most remarkable pieces are a Magnificat and Nunc Dimittis of Palestrina's. This is the first time, we imagine, that these canticles (in English) have been adapted to the music of this wonderful composer.

Of Mr. Hullah's recent publication, "The Psalms of David, with Chants," we are sorry to disapprove. We are not insensible to the service which this author has rendered to the cause of music, but here he has evidently gone beyond his province; and the result is a great failure. We know that there has been what is called a "run" of late on many of the works which Mr. H. has edited,—his popularity as a teacher naturally leading to an extensive purchase of his works; and knowing this, we feel it a duty to warn our readers against the present publication, which, if it should unhappily come to be used, would tend more than most things to ruin our Choral service. Cathedral chanting has been bad enough hitherto; but this is one step further in the downward course.

"The Church Service, and Church Music," (Burns.) "Without due attention to the musical portion, the intentions of our Prayer-Book can never be fully realized; for a great part of the services was intended to be sung. And even in country churches (in which musical skill could not generally be expected to be very great) it is directed that (with the exception of the sentences which occur at the commencement of Morning and Evening Prayer, the Lessons, the Epistle and Gospel,) the Services shall not be read, but said; by which the Church meant, that they were to be recited in that truly inspiring and devotional melody, (or, at least, as near to that as circumstances would admit,) which is now known amongst us as Cathedral Service.

"Owing to the increasing negligence of the past age, the use of this 'plain tune,' as it was anciently styled, has almost disappeared from among us. It is only in our Cathedrals, and some few other institutions, that it has been

preserved, and even in many of these it was done in such a manner as to disgust rather than to edify. In few has it been made such a help to devotion as it might be. The consequence of all this has been, that the generality of people do not know that it is the intention of our Church to have the service so conducted: neither do they know, (for they have never had the opportunity of trying,) the great aid which it furnishes to true devotional feeling.

*"Any thing which people think to be new, however right and good in itself, they regard with a kind of suspicion; and this is particularly the case in religious matters with those especially whose religion is in a great measure a matter of form, and who do not like any change, whether good or bad, simply because it puts them out of their old way, and so causes them trouble."*

"Some persons, perhaps, have been once or twice to some Cathedral, where they have heard the service badly done, and this, in addition to its being quite new to them, has displeased them, as well it might, and thus they have become impressed with the idea, that this method of chanting the service is very undevotional; whereas, in point of fact, they know nothing at all of what it really is when rightly done, and the very great assistance it is to a truly devotional spirit, when well accustomed to it, and so able heartily to join in it."—P. 5.

We have extracted this page, because it seems to us to contain such admirable, genuine, and well-expressed common sense on the subject of Church Music. And the part we have put in italics we especially suggest to the consideration of many who are, we are certain, prejudiced against Church Chanting, simply because they have not been used to it, and would really like it and be benefited by it, if they would overcome that *a priori* objection.

"A few Words to Choristers," (Burns,) from the same hand, apparently, with the preceding; giving the proper hints about behaviour, in a clear, plain, and useful way.

We have received four sermons from the able pen of Mr. Irons, of Brompton, which have been advertised under more than one title, "Sermons on our Lord and the Blessed Virgin," "Christ and the Blessed Virgin," "Our Blessed Lord regarded in His earthly Relationships," (Rivingtons): the last seems the correct heading. We mention this because the fact will help much to understanding their subject: they seem to have been preached at different times,—the last, and principal one, some two years since. And, what is remarkable, the theory propounded in it appears to have been a sort of proleptic counter-view to that taken in the recently published "Bonaventure's Life of Christ." As we have somewhat fully expressed our own view of the latter work, we are glad to find Mr. Irons contending for the same principle,—viz. the possible irreverence, if not worse, of dwelling singly on the human nature of our Lord, as well as the danger of adding details to the scriptural narration. But Mr. Irons labours under a disadvantage which in the controversy we declined: reviewers may argue against the view of other writers, but they do not feel themselves called upon to propound a consistent theory of their own in the place of that to which they object. This is not the case with a preacher: it seems little short of mockery for him to object to what other people say, unless he has

something offering to be definite and consistent with which to supply its place. And here we cannot follow Mr. Irons : we are at one with him in what he objects to ; but we think that he falls into the very same fault, *if fault it be*, which he criticises. He seems to add quite as much to the letter of Scripture, as those from whom he differs ; hence *our* conclusion is, that rather than object to the *principle* of supplement to the written Word, we must be content to take the question of details, and see whether this or that realising and picturing of details is in subordination to the analogy of faith. Thus Mr. Irons objects to "our theologians" (p. 31)—of course he is aware that the theories against which he contends are not the invention of "our," if by "our" he means English divines—for saying that the Agony in Gethsemane was either the concentration of human sin, or the heavier wrath of the Father : he says, that "Scripture does not define this ;" he calls these views, "a taxing of ingenuity rather than of reverence ;" he adds, that "they are to be feared and shrunk from, so far as they are human attempts to draw aside the veil from a Divine Mystery." And then Mr. Irons goes on to say, or rather to suggest, that the Agony consisted in the final separation of our Lord from His merely human relationships ; in the putting off of "the accidents acquired in its passage through time." Whether this view be true or not,—and Mr. Irons endeavours to fortify it by a reference to St. Chrysostom which does not seem quite to come up to the point,—we cannot but think this interpretation quite as extra-scriptural as any of S. Bonaventure's. We are not saying that Mr. Irons has not much, and what is very good, to say in support of his theory ; and we are quite sure that he says it very well and impressively,—we are not prepared to controvert his theory,—but surely it is a theory, quite as much as the statements to which he objects. We are glad to find Mr. Irons very properly criticising certain doctrinal statements of Mr. Henry Melvill, which seem to show that it is all but impossible to avoid incorrect statements upon the higher Catholic dogmas. The four sermons are a valuable step towards the right understanding of a subject unequalled in importance ; and we recommend them with this view.

Mr. Harington, of Exeter, has published a very learned and able work "On the Consecration of Churches," (Rivingtons,) which, like a previous work on the Scotch Church, from the same writer, consists, for the most part, of History's bones and frame-work : we mean, documents, facts and patristic citations. The Appendix contains the valuable form used by Bishop Andrewes at the consecration of the chapel near Southampton ; every member of the Church of England should know what *high* doctrine was once practically taught in his communion.

"Five Club Sermons," by Mr. Gibson, Vicar of Chedworth, (Hamilton, Adams, and Co.) are a sort of abbreviated Malthus and the new poor law, in the novel shape of pulpit addresses. Certainly, the benefits of Savings' Banks, (Sermon ii.) and the improvidence of what are called early marriages, (Sermons iv. v.) are unpromising subjects in the teeth of "Lay not up for yourselves," &c.—and "This is a great mystery," &c.—which sayings we observe are not the respective texts : and "the transformation of the acrid and disagreeable *apium graveolens* into the delicious celery," (p. 40.) we cannot recal, in any sermon with which we happen to be acquainted. Whether

the theology of Chedworth is as sound as its vegetable physiology, and domestic and practical economy, the present volume affords no indication.

"Sermons by William Jay." (Bartlett). These are the sermons of a dissenting minister, and are based upon the ordinary doctrines of dissent. They are decidedly, however, above the tone of their class, and exhibit simplicity of style, good sense, and quiet religious feeling.

An interesting and valuable visitation sermon has been preached at Amersham, by Mr. Shaw of Stoke Poges—"The Identity of the Jewish with the Christian Church," (Williams, Eton); not the less interesting because the same subject has been most beautifully treated by Mr. Newman. We do not quite agree with Mr. Shaw on the synagogue service, *i. e.* its *liturgical* character, which, in the proper sense of the word, the synagogue worship was not. There is a verbal inaccuracy at p. 11, where the Christian Church is said "to supplant the Jewish:" Mr. Shaw's whole argument being, that the Gospel is the expansion of the law,—his title being, "the identity" of the two,—it is obvious that there is no "supplanting" in the matter. But we are constrained to say, that the ordinary *selon les regles* phrase of "debased Christianity of Rome," &c., seems *here* quite uncalled for. We cannot feel, while we are writing in a true Catholic spirit, that we are always called upon to say, as many respected writers do, "Mind! though I am a Catholic, I am not a *Roman* Catholic." Why, of course not; the very fact that you are preaching in an English church is enough for this. Besides, Mr. Shaw is much too learned and able to encourage this sort of compounding with ignorant prejudices; he, and such as he, can afford to take a good consistent line, careless alike of what stands to the right or to the left. These little phrases always look to us like after-thoughts, foisted in for fear of the "Record," or the Radical county paper. Is Mr. Shaw quite accurate in speaking of "the detestation of the Jewish church of *every description* of image?" (p. 13.) What were the cherubic creatures? and the oxen in the temple? Apart from these minute blemishes we are much pleased with Mr. Shaw, and we trust to meet him again in a larger work.

"Songs and Hymns for the Nursery, adapted to Original Music." Parts I. and II., (Burns.) A good idea, and very neatly and prettily executed. We recommend this nice companion and assistant to the nursery.

# INDEX TO VOL. VIII.

(NEW SERIES.)

## ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

### A.

African Travellers. [*Hay's Western Barbary. Palme's Kordofan. Harris's Highlands of Ethiopia. Johnston's Southern Abyssinia.*] 227—264. Mr. Hay at Tangier, 228. Mr. Palme in Egypt, 229. Mr. Hay leaves Tangier, *ibid.* Shooting exploits, 230. Moorish superstitions, 231. The Arab tent, 232. Locusts, 233. Hunters' tales, 234. Superstition, 235. Snake-charmers, 236. Holy maniacs, 237. Kordofan, 238—251. Abyssinia—the Church, 252. The embassy, 253. Face of the country, 254, 255. Shoa, 257. Mr. Johnston, 259. Efat, 261. The Tabeebs, 264. Architecture, Church. [*Pamphlets by Close and Arnold.*] 517—531. Contradiction, 518. Restoration of churches, 519. Miserable state of churches, 520. Alleged danger of restoring too well, 521. Solomon's temple, 522. Distinction between Jewish and Christian service, 523. The Divine Presence, 524. The "Lazaretto" view, 525, 526. Churches a sign of degradation, 527. Emblems, 528. The Reformers, 529. Mr. Close's puritanism, 530. Mr. Arnold's successful reply, 531. Arnold, Dr. [*Stanley's Life of Arnold.*] 547—599. Character of the biography, 547. Arnold's birth-place and early years, 548, 549. At Oxford, 550. Marries, 551. Publicschools, 552. Arnold elected master of Rugby, 553. His reform of the public school system, 554—559. His temper, 560. His domestic and loving character, 561. Work and play, 563. Deficiency of his character, 564, 565. His Lutheran bias, 566. Church Reform, 567. Arnold's liberalism, 567, 568. His pamphlet, 569. Theory of the Church-state, 570—575. Its doctrinal aspect, 575, 576. The latitudinarian theory, 577. Rationalistic tendencies on inspiration, 578; towards Socinianism, 579. Feeling as opposed to doctrine, 580. Taste and poetic beauty, 581. Effect of the pamphlet, 582—584. Rise of the Oxford school, 585, 586. Tracts for the Times, 587. The Regale, 588. Dr. Hampden's condemnation, 589. The Oxford malignants, 590. Arnold organises a church opposition, 591. His confidence, 592, 593. His boyish naturalism, 594. Rugby his great field, 595. His mind not creative, 596, 597. His isolation and failure, 598, 599.

### B.

Bremer's, Miss, Novels. [*The Neighbours, &c.*] 13—25. Distaste for foreign novels, 13. Miss Bremer's merits, 14. Real life, 15. "Strife  
NO. XLVI.—N.S.

and peace," 17. Miss B.'s false philosophy, 19. Passive resistance in morals, 20. Refined Stoicism, 21. Protestant pantheism, 22, 23.

### C.

Campbell, the Genius of. [*Campbell's Poetical works.*] 62—72. Campbell's poetical standing and decline, 62, 63. His beauties—Gertrude of Wyoming—Theodric, 64. His lyrical powers, 65. His originality, 66. His blank verse, 68, 69. Emigrants to New South Wales, 70, 71. Chemistry. [*Fownes's Actonian Prize Essay.*] 299—306. Paley's application of Chemistry, 299. Simple elements, 306. Constitution of the atmosphere, 301. Starch, 302, 303. Animal chemistry, 304, 305. Composition of milk, 306. Colonial Church—Canada [*Visitation Journals of Bishops of Toronto, Montreal, and Nova Scotia.*] 149—168. Colonial Bishopies, 149, 150. Nova Scotia, 151. Truro, 152. Prince Edward's Island, 153. The Harbours, 154. New Brunswick, 155. Quebec, 156—158. Millerites, 159. Religious duties of England to the Colonies, 160, 161. Manatoulin Island, 162, 163. Inculcation of Church principles, 165. Commendatory letters and S.P.G., 167. Our true policy to plead the Church, 168.

### E.

Eldon, Life of Lord. [*Twiss's Life, &c.*] 274. Principles of the last century, 274. Eldon's early years, 275. Pursues the law, 276. Entrance into parliament, 277. Becomes Solicitor-General, 278. Elevated to the peerage, 279. High Steward of Oxford, 280. The Princess of Wales, *ibid.* Whig ministry, 281. Illness of George III. 282. The regency, *ibid.* Lord Eldon elevated to the earldom, 283. Canning ministry, 284. Installation of the Duke of Wellington, *ibid.* Lord Eldon's illness and death, 285. His character; political, moral, and religious, 286. Expression, Anatomy and Philosophy of. [*Sir Charles Bell on, &c.*] 130—138. Expression connected with the fine arts, 130; with religion, 131. Standard of beauty, 132, 133. Sources of expression, 134. Muscles of the face, 135. Expression in reference to the body, 136. Study of anatomy and of the antique, 137. The nervous system, 138.

### F.

Fouqué, Life and Writings of. See Vol. VII. p. 317. [*Lebensgeschichte des Baron de la Motte Fouqué, &c.*] 307—328. Poetry, the

expression of repressed emotions, 307. Fouqué's tutor, Sachse, 308, 309. His tutor, Hulsén, 310. Fouqué becomes acquainted with the Scandinavian myths, 311. His confirmation, 313. Clerical laxity throughout Europe, 314. French Revolution, 315. Fouqué enters the army, 316, 317. Intercessory prayer, 318, 319. Campaign of 1794, 320, 321. Element of poetry, 322. Fouqué's marriage, 323. His studies, 324. Duel, 325, 326. Devotes himself to literature, 327. His conversion, 328.

Frederick William of Prussia. [*Eyler's Religious Life and Opinions of King Frederick William.*] 113—129. German protestantism, 113. Absence of the episcopate, 114, 115. Evangelical Church of Prussia, 116. The Catholic rule, 117. Proposed union between the Church of England and the Prussian communion, 118. Frederick William, 119. Effects of Lutheranism and Calvinism, 121. Frederick William a religious person, 122. Prussian education, 124—127. Union of the Lutheran and Calvinistic bodies, 128. Impossibility of Prussian and Anglican intercommunion, 129.

## G.

Garbett's Sermon. [*Is Unauthorized Teaching always Schismatical? &c.*] 1—13. Mr. Garbett's natural talents, 1. Mr. Garbett a mere rhetorician, 2; a talker, 3. Why noticed, 4. Conduct of the Vice-Chancellor on his sermon, 5, 6. Aspect of the University authorities, 6, 7. Mr. Garbett the accredited champion of a school, 8. Extracts from his sermon on the sacraments, 9. Apostolical commission, 10. Unauthorized teaching, 11. Creeds, Articles, and the Church, 12.

## H.

Hagiology, Recent. [*Iustorum Semita. Bonaventura's Life of Christ. Lives of the English Saints.*] 40—63. New aspect of the controversy with Rome, 40. Miracles, 41. Criteria of the Church, 42. Lives of the English Saints—probable results, 43. Unreality, 44. Lucius and Eleutherius, *ibid.* Germanus and Lupus, 45. Life of S. Walpurga, 45—48. Her relics, 49. Character of alleged miracles, 50, 51. Credibility, 52. Final cause of legendary histories, 53. Their mythic character, 54, 55. Bonaventura's Life of Christ—additions to the written Word, 55—58. Legends of B. V. M., 59. Castro, 60. Bishop Montague on the B. V. M., 60—62.

## I.

Ireland. [*The Irish Sketch-Book.*] 456—475. Mr. M. A. Titmarsh, 456. Theory of ridicule, 457. Its legitimate use, 458. Its application to religion, 459. Arising from a sense of moral wrong, 460. Mr. Thackeray's fairness, 461. Irish Sermons, 462—464. Dundalk—Armagh, 465. Reality of Romish worship, 466, 467. The Irish a religious people, 468. Dutiful and loyal, 469. Functions of the Church, 470, 471. Maynooth, 472. Irish Protestantism, 473. Remedial measures, 474. Lighter character of the Sketch-Book, 475.

## K.

Kebble's Lectures on Poetry. [*Kebble's De Poetica Vi Medica.*] 407—453. The law of contrast, 408. Applied to poetry, 409. Mr. Kebble's contributions to the scientific conception of poetry, *ibid.* Aristotle's theory, 410, 411. Plato's theory, 412. Plato acknowledges the moral efficacy, 413. Kebble's theory, 414—416. Reserve, 417. Application to the fine

arts, 418. Enthusiasm, 419. Final cause of the poetic art, 420. Classification of poets, 421—424. Heroism, 425. Consistency of Homer, 426. The Odyssey, 427—429. Aeschylus, 430—432. Sophocles, 433. Euripides, 434. Lucretius, 435. Choice of materials, 436, 437. Poetic madness, 438. Connexion of true religion with poetry, 439. Religious poetry, 440. Virgil, 441—446. Aeneid, Book VI. 447—449. The heart and affections, 450, 452. Poetry of ideas, 453. Wordsworth, 454—455.

## M.

Middle Ages, Scriptural Knowledge of the. [*Maitland's Dark Ages.*] 287—298. Ignorance as to the real character of the middle ages, 287. Mediæval knowledge of Scripture, 288. References to Scripture in mediæval writers, 289. Sermons of Peter of Blois, 289, 290. St. Thomas Aquinas, 291. Commentaries on Scripture, 291, 292. Catena Aurea, 293. Lectures in religious houses, 295. Reverence paid to the Bible, 295. Manuscript copies of the Scriptures, 296. Alleged popular ignorance of Scripture, 297. Mystery-plays, 298. Missions. [*Grant's Bampton Lectures.*] 25—39. Conversion of the heathen, 25. Dr. Grant's lectures, 26. The Gospel scheme of evangelizing the world, 27. The ordained means, 28. Unity, 29. Instrumentality of the Church, 31. British colonies, 32. Progress of the Gospel in the middle ages, *ibid.* The monastic bodies, 33. Defects of our present position, 35. Failure of modern missions, 36. The true method of missions, 37. Want of a missionary college, 38; and of a received manual of doctrine, 39. Montgomery's Gospel before the Age. [*Gospel before the Age, &c.*] 265—274. Mr. Montgomery unreal, 265. Claims to belong to no party, *ibid.* Review writing, 267. Mr. Montgomery's critics, *ibid.* His plagiarism, 268—270. His doctrinal views, 271. The Creeds—the Ministry—the Church, 272. Unmeaning verbiage of evangelical phraseology, *ibid.* Citation from Bp. Patrick, 273.

## N.

National Society and Church Education. [*How can the Church Educate the People?*] 72—81. National education, 72. Diocesan training schools, 73. Management of the National Society—want of confidence in it, 74. Government inspection, 75. Stanley Grove, 76. Committee of Council, *ibid.* Working of inspection, 77. Committee of Correspondence, 78. Diocesan Boards, *ibid.* Colleges for the middle classes, 79, 80.

## P.

Poor-law in Scotland. [*Alison on the Poor in Scotland. Report of the Commission of Inquiry.*] 476—506. The old and new poor-laws, 476. State of the Scottish poor—theory and practice, 477. Dr. Alison's exertions, 478. Comparison of Scotland with an English union, 479. Hawick—Kelso, 480. Ladykirk, 481. Dunbar, 482, 483. Haddington, 484. Edinburgh, 485—496. Glasgow, 497, contrasted with Manchester, 498. Private poor-houses, 499, 500. Pauper lunatics in Arran, 501. Laurencekirk, 502. Argyllshire, 503. Badges, 504. Recapitulation, 505. Prints and Print Collecting. [*The Print Collector.*] 506—517. Taste for prints, 506. Hudson, 507. Pleasure derivable from prints, *ibid.* Classification, 508. Proofs, 509. Price of prints, 510. Different "states," 511.



Mistakes of catalogues, 512. Preserving prints—print cleaning, 513. Combination of engraver and artist, *ibid.* Print trade, 514. Modern prints, 515. Contrast of copper-engraving with wood-engraving, 516. Requisites for good wood-cuts, 517.  
 Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church. [*Marshall's Penitential Discipline, &c.*] 339—371. Study of the Ecclesiastical law, 340. Dr. Marshall's book, 341. Application of the power of the keys to the tribunal of penitence, 342. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, 343. Combination of spiritual and temporal law, 344. Jurisdiction voluntary and contentious, 345. Distinction between spiritual jurisdiction and temporal power, 345. Criminal branch of the Church's jurisdiction, 346. The external forum, 347. The internal forum, 348. Excommunication, 349. Parts of penance, 350. Confession—Penitential canons, 351, 352. Constituent parts of discipline—agregation, 353. The first station, 354. Second and third stations, 355. Prostration, 356. Fourth station, 357. Absolution, 358. The two forums, 359. Relaxation of discipline, 360. Confession to the priest instead of the public exhomologesis, 361. Separation of the two jurisdictions, 362. Key of heaven and key of order, 363. Bishops devolve the penitentiary's office to the inferior order, 364. Operation of the separated forums, 365. Revival of primitive discipline, 366. Union of the two keys, 367. Study of Ecclesiastical law, 368. Mediatorial office of the priesthood, 369. Appointment of Suffragan Bishops, or Choroepiscopi, 370, 371.

R.

Restoration of Churches. [*Hook's Sermon at Leamington, &c.*] 138—149. Moral obligation to restore churches, 139. Beauty, 140. Duty, 141. Obligations of property, 142. Rights of the Church, 143; and of the poor, 144, 145. Hook's sermon, 146. Progress of decay, *ibid.* Want of means, 147.

S.

Scotland. Catholic Church in Past Days. [*Lyon's History of St. Andrews.*] 168—185. Peculiar position of Scotland—paucity of churches, 169. Presbyterian meeting-houses, 170. Presbyterian service, 171. Offices, 172. The sacred year, 173. Absence of Catholic feeling, 174. State of Scotland, 175. Fall of the ancient Scottish Church, 176. Its probable state and lack of national influence, 176. Size of ancient parishes, 177. Tran-

sient character of its ecclesiastical institutions, 178, 179. State after the Reformation, 180, 181. Church of the Restoration, 182. Signs of hope in Scotland, 183. Peculiar position of Scotland in regard to schism, 184. Symons, Dr. and the Vice-Chancellorship [*The English Churchman, Times, &c.*] 532—546. Horace Walpole's Remembrancer and the Christian Remembrancer, 532. *Delenda est Oxonia*, 533. Character and rights of convocation, 534. The Duke of Wellington, 535, 536. Encroachments of the Hebdomadal Board, 537. The reign of Wynter, *ibid.* Its connexion with Dr. Symons, 538. The Six Doctors, 539. Superior criminality of Dr. Wynter, 540. Dr. Symons's share in Dr. Pusey's condemnation, 541, 542. Disturbing the peace, 543. Residents and non-residents, 545. The day of nomination, 546.

T.

Tasso, Life of. (See Vol. VII. p. 236.) 185—207. His captivity, 186. Costantini, 187. Tasso's reception at Mantua, 188. Tasso visits Bergamo, 189. Returns to Mantua, 190. At Bologna, 191. At Rome, 192. At Naples, 193. Apparition of his good spirit, *ibid.* His misery, 194. "Reply of Rome to Plutarch," 195. Tasso arrives at Florence, 196. Returns to Rome, 197. Corrects his epic, 198. His lawsuit, 199. His life at S. Severino, 200. His final independence, 202. His sickness and death, 203. His funeral, 204. Honours and portraits, 205. His character, 206.

Toronto, University of. [*Proceedings at laying the Foundation-stone of King's College, Toronto.*] 372—407. Aspect of the North American colonies, 372. History of Canada, 373. First attempt at a grammar school—project of a university, 374—376. Archdeacon Strachan, 376. Sir P. Maitland, 379. Sir J. Colborne, *ibid.* Charter, 380. Aggressions of House of Assembly, 381. Sir Francis Head, 382. Sir G. Arthur, 383. Presbyterian influence, 384. Sir Charles Bagot, 385. Sir Charles Metcalfe, 386. The college in operation, 387. Difficulties of the college, 389. Chapel and lectures, 391. Constitution and discipline, 392. Attacks of the provincial parliament, 393. Education and religion, 394. "Essential" doctrines, 395, 396. Royal prerogative, 397, 398. Proposed rescinding of the royal charter, 399. Practical inquiry, 400. Policy, 402. Objectionable constitution of the council, 404. Convocation, 405. Religious test, 406. Suggested course, 407.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A.

Allbuch Das, 603.  
 Alford's Prose Hymns, 329.

B.

Barter's Sermon, 606.  
 Bull and Cosin. S.P.C.K. edition, 85, 210.

C.

Cheyne's Synod Sermon, 603.

E.

Ellen Middleton, 81.  
 Elier's Anglicanischen Kirchen, 604.  
 England, History of, S.P.C.K. edition, 87.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>G.</p> <p>Goode's Altars Prohibited, 92.</p> <p>M.</p> <p>Mill's University Sermons, 94.</p> <p>Mind amongst the Spindles, 211.</p> | <p>S.</p> <p>S.P.C.K. (See Bull, and History of England.)</p> <p>W.</p> <p>Waverley Novels; Abbotsford Edition, 207.</p> <p>Wilberforce's Sermons before the Queen, 600.</p> |
|--|--|

## SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

- JULY.—Fosberry's Hymns for the Sick—Brown's *Ordo Sacrorum*—Tracts of the Congregational Union—Brockedon's Italy—Bramhall, Anglo-Catholic Library Edition—Hawker's Rural Synods, and Reeds Shaken by the Wind—Price's Communion Service (Musical)—The Birth-day—Genoveva—Dewar's German Protestantism—Bartlett's Walks about Jerusalem—Wilberforce's Scripture Reading Lessons—Lectures on Scripture Doctrines—Burns' Christian Fragments—Ward's Ideal of a Christian Church—Transactions of the Exeter Architectural Society—The Hope of the Katschopfs—Report of the Cambridge Camden Society—Smith's Inquiry into Catholic Truths, &c.—Watson and Ridley on Confirmation—Fowie's House of God, &c.—*Cur Templarum antiqua?*—Brett's Honour of the Priesthood—Address to Parents of School Children—Bishop Doane's Pastoral—Marriott's *Analecta Christiana*—Sermons by Manning, Boone, &c., 96—100.
- AUGUST.—Mr. Maskell's Ancient Liturgy, according to the Uses of Sarum, &c.—Dyce's Introductory Lecture—Visiting Societies and Lay Readers—Bishop Wilson on the Lord's Supper (Oxford Edition)—Miss Goldie's Freedom not Lawlessness—Courtney's Future State—Jewell's Christian Politics—Hope's Essays—Evans's Family Prayer—Tales of the Martyrs—Zachokke's Hours of Meditation—Spalding's Sacred History of Man—Second Thoughts on the Irish Board of Education—Hints to promote a Life of Faith—Montague's Seven Penitential Psalms in Verse—Dr. Jarvis's Sermon, 215—217.
- OCT. to DEC.—Lachrymæ Ecclesiæ—Thomdike's Rights, by Brewer—Christie on Scottish Communion Office—S.P.G. Tracts on Missions—Yearsley's Aural Surgery—"Spirit of Dissent" towards the Church of England—Bishop Doane's Conventional Address—Selous' Illustrations of Sintram—Ambrose Ward—Mestral's "Ecole Théologique"—Sunday Afternoons, by the Author of the "Listener"—Rebecca Nathan—Archdeacon Hoare's Charge—Bridge's Sacramental Address—Hearn on Rome—The Wakefield Tracts—Pagano-Papianus—Hope's Essays—Fouqués Wild Love, and other Tales—Gilly's Vigilantius and his Times—Love's Chapters on the Working People—De Lamartine's Jocelyn—Dr. Pusey's Two Sermons, and Edition of Surin—Abbey Church, &c.—S.P.G. Report—Lady Chatterton's Pyrenees—Baptismal Fonts—Godley's Letters from Canada—Gutzlaff's China—Motett Society's Music—Hullah's Psalms, with Chants—Church Service, and Church Music—Few Words to Choristers—Irons' Sermons—Harrington's Consecration of Churches—Gibson's Club Sermons—Jay's Sermons—Shaw's Visitation Sermon—Songs and Hymns for the Nursery, 607—618.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Conventual Institutions, Revival of, 218—331. | Newfoundland, Bishop's Church Ship, 225, |
| Ireland, and the House of Commons, 102.       | 226.                                     |
| Maurice's Kingdom of Christ, 101.             | Tithes Commutation, 338.                 |

## ECCLESIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Ordinations—Preferments—Appointments—Deaths of Clergy—Proceedings of Church | Societies—Colonial Church—Miscellaneous Intelligence, &c.—Pp. 108, 221, 337. |
|---|--|

England.)

207.  
600.

ation—  
tagne's  
Dr. Jar-

Thom-  
Scottish  
n Mis-  
pirit of  
land—  
ress—  
mbrose  
que"—  
of the  
deacon  
al Ad-  
ukefield  
Essays  
ales—  
Love's  
De La-  
rmmons,  
i, &c.—  
yresen-  
s from  
ociety's  
anta—  
—Few  
s—Ha-  
Gibson's  
s Visi-  
for the

p, 225,

laneous